

ANGLO- SOVIET JOURNAL

MAY 1974

Vol. XXXIV

No. 3

Russian Painting

Esenin

Stage Direction

Obraztsov

New Constitution

30p.

SCR

Society for Cultural Relations with the USSR

320 BRIXTON ROAD, LONDON SW9 6AB

Tel.: 01-274 2282

OFFICERS 1973-74

President: HON. IVOR MONTAGU, M.A., F.Z.S.

Vice Presidents:

W. W. BEGLEY, F.R.I.B.A., F.R.Hist.S., ALAN BUSH,
LORD CHORLEY OF KENDAL, Q.C., PROFESSOR GEORGES CUNELLI,
Dr. MAURICE DOBB, JACK LINDSAY, Dr. SIDNIE MANTON, F.R.S.,
Miss MARY MERRALL, PROFESSOR JOAN ROBINSON, M.A., F.B.A.,
ANDREW ROTHSTEIN, M.A., JULIUS SILVERMAN, M.P.

Chairman: Dr. L. CROME, M.C., F.R.C.P.

Vice-Chairmen:

DENNIS OGDEN, B.A., Dr. DAVID LANE

Hon. Treasurer: MARTIN LAWRENCE

Secretary: RUTH KISCH, B.A.

Council: (*Executive Committee Members): Dr. J. BARBER, Professor R. BROWNING, M.A.,
H. C. CREIGHTON, M.A., *Dr. L. CROME, M.C., F.R.C.P., *Professor P. FELTHAM, Ph.D., D.Sc.,
F.Inst.P., *Mrs. BARBARA FISHER, B.A., Mr. S. FORMAN, *J. S. GREGORY, B.Sc., M. HOOKHAM,
B.Sc. (Econ.), G. HYDE, Dr. D. LANE, *M. LAWRENCE, *D. OGDEN, B.A., *J. PLATTS-MILLS, Q.C.,
B. P. POCKNEY, B.A., B.Sc., J. W. RIORDAN, B.A., *Mrs. IRENE SLATTER, *Professor J. S. SPINK,
M.A., D. de l'Univ., Mrs. K. WILLIAMS, M.A., *Commander E. YOUNG, R.N. (rtd).

ARE YOU A MEMBER OF THE SCR?

The SCR offers many facilities to individual members and affiliated organisations including specialist tours, study courses, information, visual aids, reference library, film shows, speakers, etc. Why not send for further details?

Name (Mr./Mrs./Miss).....

Address

.....
Please send details of SCR facilities

Affiliation details requiredYES/NO

ANGLO- SOVIET JOURNAL

MAY 1974

VOLUME XXXIV No. 3

CONTENTS

<i>title</i>	<i>author</i>	<i>page</i>
BRITISH INTEREST IN RUSSIAN PAINTING	Dr. Alan Bird	3
STAGE DIRECTION	Donald Bisset	9
NEW SOVIET CONSTITUTION	Marthe Brown	16
ESENIN	Dr. Jessie Davies	26
MOSCOW	Teresa Fisher	31
OBRAZTSOV	Interview	36
BOOK REVIEWS		41

Editorial Board:

M. Hookham (Editor) W. W. Begley, Professor R. Browning,
Dr. L. Crome, R. Daglish, Dr. D. Lane, M. Lavery, D. Ogden,
B. P. Pockney, J. W. Riordan, C. E. Simmonds

MAGNOLIA HOLIDAYS

1974

15-Day fully inclusive AIR HOLIDAYS in the **SOVIET Union**



Departures from LONDON (Gatwick). All with comprehensive sightseeing in either or both **MOSCOW** and **LENINGRAD** or **KIEV**.

Here are a few examples of these tours, all specially designed to ensure that, with the friendly welcome which awaits you, you will enjoy every minute of your visit.

IML 2	BLACK SEA 3-CENTRE TOUR	Moscow · Sochi · Leningrad	from £120
IML 3	CAUCASUS TOUR	Moscow · Erevan · Baku · Tbilisi · Leningrad	from £134
IML 4	CENTRAL ASIA TOUR	Leningrad · Dushanbe · Samarkand Bukhara · Urgench/Khiva · Tashkent · Moscow	from £162
IML 5	BLACK SEA 3-CENTRE TOUR	Kiev · Yalta · Moscow	from £120
IML 6	UKRAINIAN TOUR	Kiev · Kharkov · Moscow · Leningrad	from £124
IML 7	BLACK SEA 4-CENTRE TOUR	Kiev · Donetsk · Sochi · Moscow	from £120

Prices include twin-bedded rooms with bath/shower and w.c., 3 meals per day, service charges, sightseeing, transport and portage, Single room supplement £17.

FLY TO A SUPER VALUE 11-DAY CRUISE on the **VOLGA and DON**

A TOTAL OF 15 DAYS
FROM ONLY £130

See Moscow, the Red Square and the treasures of the Kremlin as well as enjoying a delightful cruise in a superbly equipped and comfortable river boat between Kazan, the Tatar capital, and Rostov-on-Don, the gateway to the Caucasus. Sightseeing at all the ports of call, with guide interpreters, is by motor coach.

Departure from Gatwick
22nd July '74



Offer your clients an exciting and really unique holiday by sending today for our brochures with the full details of these fascinating tours.



INTOURIST MOSCOW LTD.

292 Regent Street, London, W.1

Tel: 01-580 4974/5

Member of A.B.T.A.



The Growth of British Interest in Russian Painting

Dr. Alan Bird

It was not until the late nineteenth century that Russian art historians and critics turned their attention to the painting of their native land and began to examine its historical development. The initiative of Serge Diaghilev in organising the great exhibition of *Three Centuries of Historical Portraits* in 1905 marks the beginning of Russia's own interest in her painting. The establishment of the Russian Museum in Leningrad and the Tretyakov Gallery in Moscow as well as other minor museums and the publication of various art journals, among them *The World of Art* (1898-1904), *Treasures of Russian Art* (1901-), *The Old Years* (1907-) and *Apollon* (1909-), were the means by which the Russian public became acquainted with the history of its art. Although there was considerable investigation into the art of the icon and there were several distinguished collectors it was not until after the 1917 revolution that the identification, cleaning and restoration of the icons began in earnest. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that in Western Europe little should have been known of Russian painting until fairly recent times.

Peter the Great began the custom of sending young artists abroad to study at such European art centres as Venice, Paris, Amsterdam, Rome and Paris. Later rulers, the Imperial Treasury, and a few cultural agencies continued this work; and many were the complaints by the professors in Paris and elsewhere who, to paraphrase Turgenev, were at first amazed by the industry of their Russian students and then equally amazed by their indolence and complete avoidance of the painting studio. These students made no artistic impact outside their native land. Nor did those European artists who worked in Russia leave much in the way of comment on cultural life although Madame Vigee-Lebrun did record some impressions and exclaimed with wonder, "I see here Russians who are ordered to be sailors, huntsmen, musicians, engineers, painters or actors, and who become all these things according to their master's will. And they are all alert, attentive, obedient, and respectful." The British artists who were invited to the Court do not seem to have found it worth while commenting on their Russian colleagues. This is particularly tantalising since George Dawe (1781-1829), a pupil of Lawrence, who went to record the generals who had served in the Napoleonic Wars, appears not to have kept a diary. It is recorded that during a chance and fleeting encounter

he made a memorable sketch of Pushkin which has now disappeared. He must surely have come into contact with a few Russian artists, for in 1819 he might have met two of the finest portraitists of the late eighteenth century: Dimitri Levitsky (1735-1822) and Vladimir Borovikovsky (1757-1825) whose careers had not fully ended. In fact, Levitsky's superb portrait of the philosopher Diderot was the first Russian painting to enter a Western gallery when it was presented to the city museum at Geneva by his heirs.

It may be that the first Russian artist to stay on British soil for any length of time had already left our shores before George Dawe had set sail. In 1799 Lord Elgin had employed a small group of artists, architects and craftsmen to proceed from Rome to Athens where they were ordered to sketch, record and supervise the removal of classical statuary. Among them was an odd individual Feodor Ivanovich (1763-1832) who is known to history as Lord Elgin's Kalmuk. After activities in Greece had come to an end he was asked to come to England and engrave the drawings he had made of the remains. Probably the Kalmuk had friends here, particularly John George Frye, the illegitimate son of George IV, with whom he had studied in Rome in the nineties; and it is reported that during his stay (1803-1805) he began a historical composition, possibly of a neo-classical nature, for the royal family. He left for Germany without, it seems, receiving satisfactory payment from Lord Elgin who had been detained in France as a prisoner-of-war and with whom he was to renew contact in Paris in an attempt to secure recompense. When in 1815 Colnaghi and Co., of London, published his engraved self-portrait it was surely the first time a Russian artist had been brought to the attention of the British public. The caption (not entirely accurate), read:

The portrait of Fedor, a Kalmuk Slave (Drawn and Engraved by himself) who was given by the present Empress of Russia, to her mother the Margravine of Baden; having shewn a disposition for the Arts the Margravine sent him to Rome, in order to improve himself in Painting and Drawing; he now resides at Carlsruhe, where he enjoys the reputation of a clever Artist.

During the nineteenth century a number of the major Russian artists studied abroad, frequently in Rome or Munich, among them the artist who grandiloquently combined classical and romantic elements, Karl Bryullov (1799-1852). His immense *Last Days of Pompeii* (1828), exhibited in Rome in 1828, swept European romantic sensibility: it is claimed that the dying Sir Walter Scott sat in front of it for an hour and remarked that it was not a painting but an epic. Indirectly it inspired a novel which once enjoyed great popularity but which has now passed from favour—Bulwer Lytton's

Last Days of Pompeii (1834). Alexander Ivanov (1806-1858), arguably the greatest Russian artist of the nineteenth century, also studied in Rome, and on his way home in 1858 called on Herzen in London. An English critic has left a little-known account of Ivanov standing before his great canvas *Christ Appearing to the People* on which he toiled for over twenty years:

In my mind's eye, I see him now, silent and sad, careworn and broken in health, as he stood beneath the immense canvas which embodied the anxious toil of twenty years. He had borne up against poverty, he had struggled manfully through obscurity, and then as the goal was reached, he died.

Students of Russian painting will know that Ivanov's goal had not been reached with his *Appearance of Christ* which was coldly received in Russia where, quite rightly, his sunlit sketches of Italian life, beautiful and glimmering impressionist landscapes, and mystical illustrations to his projected study of the progress of mankind are far more appreciated. It was this same critic, J. Beavington Atkinson, who in 1873 (and in earlier articles) gave the British public the first account of Russian painting, incomplete and unscholarly, but with some insight unusual for its period—as, for instance, when he described one of Levitsky's Smolny Institute portraits, exhibited at the 1862 International Exhibition, as “one of the very best products of the Russian School . . . only inferior to Reynolds in colour and felicity of touch”. He was remarkably prompt in saluting the new group of painters which were “tending to naturalism and realism . . .”: this group which we know as the *peredvizhniki* had only come into being after 1863. Atkinson recognised the talents of Vereshtchagin, Gay, Makovsky and Perov and wrote sympathetically of the latter's *The Village Burial* as “a touching incident, mourners bearing in a sledge a coffin through the snow’.

It was not, however, until 1896 that there appeared the first brief history of Russian painting. Alexander Benois (1870-1960) who while still a young man had attained an European reputation as an art-historian and critic of his country's art was approached to supply a section for Muther's *A History of Modern Painting* (1896). Benois's attitude is somewhat rhapsodical and rather too full of comparisons: in his attempt to establish the quality of the artists he admires (or detests—because Benois was never an impartial historian) they are likened to Dutch, Italian and French masters, often in a far-fetched manner. His preferences were for the eighteenth century and he was wilfully prejudiced against the neo-classical artists and those nineteenth century painters whose origins were not Italian. Twenty years later Benois published another brief account of Russian painting in which his detestations and admirations are hardly modified.

In the same year there appeared an extraordinary work which unlike other compilations of its kind contained serious and original criticism and which had escaped critical notice until I drew attention to it in a review I wrote for the *Burlington Magazine* some years ago. *The Soul of Russia* was an anthology edited in 1916 by Winifred Stephens on behalf of Russians who had lost their homes and belongings in flight from the battlefield. Not only did it contain a fragment of music by Stravinsky and poems by Briusov and Balmont but also articles on icons, music and ballet. Nicholas Roerich contributed a brief article on Russian art and AMARI (Tsetlin, Berlin, 1882-1945) wrote an appreciation of the work of Natalia Goncharova (1881-1926). There were also colour reproductions of costume design by Goncharova and Larionov who at this time were still in the artistic *avant-garde* and whose artistic achievement was hardly known in Russia let alone in the West.

From the revolution of 1917 to the outbreak of war in 1939 comparatively little was written or published on Russian painting, although there was an interesting exhibition at the Grafton Galleries in the spring of 1917. In 1935, however, there was a splendid exhibition of all aspects of pre-revolutionary Russian Art held at Belgrave Square, London, with a lengthy catalogue compiled by Mary Chamot who has since published critical articles as well as books on Russian Painting and Natalia Goncharova. Under the editorship of the late David Talbot Rice there was issued a little work called *Russian Art* which contained informative notices relating to aspects of the exhibition. Mrs. Talbot Rice was herself to write two accounts of Russian Art (in 1949 and 1963) which contain much useful comment of a general nature. Roughly speaking, these books did not contain detailed reference to painting of the Soviet period which was precisely what many art-lovers wished to know about. There had, however, been a useful compilation in 1935 when G. Holme edited *Art in the USSR*, a series of essays by authoritative Russian critics, and many valuable illustrations. In 1944, Jack Chen who had apparently studied art in Leningrad, possibly with Filonov, published *Soviet Art and Artists*, an interesting but misleading account with very little factual background. Two years later C. Bunt published his useful *Russian Art from Scythians to Soviets*. Meanwhile there had appeared a *History of Modern Russian Painting, 1840-1940* (1945) by the veteran critic G. Lukomsky, an extraordinary book which seems to have been composed from articles and bibliographical dictionaries stuck together without regard to logic, historical order, or common sense; and yet which contained, for its time, much information on Soviet painters which could not be found elsewhere. In 1948 Jack Chen reappeared in print, this time supplying the commentary and catalogue to an

exhibition of Russian Painting of the 18th and 19th centuries held under the auspices of the Society for Cultural Relations with the USSR in London in 1948.

Since that date the whole field of Russian painting has been widely covered both in specialist and general publications of varying merits. Richard Hare's *The Art and Artists of Russia* (1965) has been one of the most disappointing, especially since he possessed the taste, interest and scholarship to write an authoritative history, while G. H. Hamilton's *The Art and Architecture of Russia* (1954), although out-dated and sadly vitiated in critical tone by the fact that the author had seen few of the works of art about which he wrote, is still the most useful general account. It could be claimed that an informed social history of Russian painting from earliest times down to our day is still lacking.

Camilla Gray pioneered the way for an understanding of painting in the early years of our century. Generally speaking, she failed to understand the complexity and devious nature of the *peredvizhniki*, overestimated the achievement, great though it was, of Larionov and Goncharova, and presented the Malevich-Tatlin axis as entirely representative of the Russian *avant-garde*. But her book was wonderfully illustrated and of the greatest importance when it appeared in 1962. By sympathy Camilla Gray was drawn to the futurist-constructivist elements in Russian art, sometimes more to the sculptural and architectural elements than to painting; and in this she was, of course, in line with the thinking of a number of young Soviet art-historians. She did not deal with the tangled interests and changes of direction which lead to the promulgation of the doctrine of social realism in the early nineteen-thirties nor did she concern herself with such interesting individual artists as Chekrygin whose work is now being rediscovered following the important exhibition arranged by E. Levitin, the young authority on Rembrandt, at the Pushkin Museum in 1969. Inevitably, perhaps, there has been a regrettable tendency to assume that apart from the work of Tatlin and Malevich (and I make so bold as to say that some of the more realistic aspects of their painting have been almost deliberately slurred over), there has been little painting of value in the USSR since about 1921. This is absolutely incorrect; and the time may already be at hand for a reassessment both of those artists who agreed to work within the ethos of social realism and those who went their own ways without, however, disregarding their artistic responsibilities to their fellow citizens.

It may be appropriate to mention here a well-illustrated book which although Czech in source has given British readers the best pictorial survey of pre-twentieth century painting: *Russian Painting of the 18th and 19th centuries* (1953) by V. Fiala. The coloured

reproductions are by no means impeccably correlated with the originals and some painters, Bruni and Bryullov among them, do not receive justice but, taken as a whole, this is the only volume which gives the best overall view of Russian painting of those centuries. Catalogues of the Russian Museum and the Tretyakov Gallery are promised in the fairly near future and should prove invaluable to art scholars, especially since authoritative works on Levitsky, Kiprensky, Borovikovsky and Bryullov—and other important artists—are not easily available here.

The field of Russian painting which has been opened up dramatically is that of early mural and icon-painting. There have been numerous works on these subjects by V. Lazarev and M. V. Alpatov, frequently translated into English and published by Russian publishing houses for sale abroad in the English-speaking countries. The glorious works of Rublev, Theophanes and Dionysius and the styles of the regional schools and cities have been a revelation to artists and art-critics, none of which was known to anyone in the West (and few in Russia itself) before the revolution. In no other area have successive Soviet governments shown more clearly their concern with the country's cultural heritage than in the preservation and restoration of these early masterpieces and their publication in albums and scholarly editions.

Certainly much remains to be studied in the history of Russian painting and British students do not find it very easy to find the texts and illustrations they need for a full acquaintance. But, as this brief summary may have shown, there has been an enormous increase in the number of books and critical articles on Russian painting. It is safe to prophesy that there will be more works, preferably of a specialised kind—and here Larissa Salmina-Haskell's detailed catalogues of the drawings in the Ashmolean and Victoria and Albert Museum collections come to mind—which provide more of the details and facts which art-scholars require for a balanced assessment of the achievements of Russian painting. What cannot be doubted is that as art historians and others begin to realise the need for a total assessment of twentieth-century painting they will turn more and more to Russian achievements, experiments and, even, failures. It is to be hoped, nevertheless, that this will not be at the expense of a wider interest in the total history of Russian painting which is probably more difficult to appreciate because it is so far removed from our own times and because of the economic, social and political complexities which have to be taken into serious account and which too many art historians and critics disregard to the disadvantage of their studies.

Stage Direction

Donald Bisset

(A review article based on Georgi Tovstonogov, *The Profession of the Stage Director*, translated by Bryan Bean. *Progress*, 1972.)

“One must love art, and not oneself in art.” Stanislavsky.

Tovstonogov is a devoted Communist, a social realist, a disciple of Stanislavsky, and a tolerant man. I shall touch on some of Tovstonogov’s directional precepts later. They are interesting and valuable. But the greatest value of his book consists in his clear appreciation of an artist’s civic responsibilities and the correct mental processes through which art work is achieved. We have in the West a pejorative concept of socialist realism due, in part, to the appearance in English of story writing that is sociological rather than artistic in its approach and, in part, to the fact that some Soviet Academicians have expounded the theory in rather a philistine manner.

Before discussing Tovstonogov’s book, I would like to quote two definitions of the theory of art that are, to my mind, valid. The first is from the late Professor Bernal’s *Science in History*: “The artist observes in order to transform, through his own experience and feeling, what he sees into some new evocative creation.”

The second from Stanislavsky in *My Life in Art*: “True art fades whenever it approaches tendential, utilitarian, unartistic paths. In art tendency must change into its own ideas, pass into emotion, become a sincere effort and the second nature of the actor. Only then can it enter into the life of the human spirit in the actor, the role, the play. But then it is no longer a tendency, it is a personal credo. The spectator can make his own conclusions, and create his own tendency from what he receives in the theatre. The natural conclusion is reached of itself in the soul and mind of the spectator from what he sees in the actor’s creative efforts. This is a necessary condition and it is only when such a condition is present that one can think in the theatre of producing plays of a social and political character”

A Soviet artist then should have noble ideals, a love of his country, and its struggle, through Communism, to produce a better type of man. If he looks at this from the outside and endeavours to produce what is demanded of him, he will fail. His work will be, at best, sociological and, at worst, philistine. He has himself to be a social realist and feel these ideals, and transform them through his art, otherwise he will merely reflect, not advance these ideals, and, in doing so, will do more harm than good because his own lack of

true feeling will be transmitted to his readers or his audience. His work will be repetitive and dull.

In this aphorism at the head of this article (one must love art, and not oneself in art) it is clear that Stanislavsky is referring to many people who enjoy the limelight and the atmosphere of praise and adulation associated with the stage. That is loving oneself in art. And, it seems to me, there may be a few people in the Party who do not love Communism but themselves in Communism. People, perhaps, who have been part of the long, brave and relentless struggle against the bourgeoisie, who have earned their place in the vanguard of Soviet society, but resent new people who do not strictly adhere to the ideas for which they have fought. It is possible that they *do* love Communism, but also themselves in Communism. Marxism means change. Younger people, in the light of a new situation, may advance Marxism. And some tendencies to resist this may be subjective. There is too, sometimes, a genuine misunderstanding of the necessary working of an artist's mind.

Having acquired knowledge, an artist cannot lead with knowledge; he can only, in his work, transcend it. This is necessarily not a conscious process. The fact that it is unconscious and therefore, in a sense, blind, takes the artist maybe in right directions or wrong directions, but, at any rate, in new directions. He develops a concept which the people have a perfect right to resist, but not to dictate. And, at the same time, we should not make it a tenet that art should be necessarily immediately comprehensible to the people at large. To say this is not to distrust people but to recognise that people have imagination. Art can only exist because people have imagination. They must be allowed to develop it and use it. Trusting people means trusting their inherent capacity for development. I think it is enough if an artist loves truth and beauty and writes or paints with his own heart's blood. Only in this way can he transcend his consciousness and produce work that is in fact better than he knows.

Should there be a total abolition of censorship? A Soviet citizen can point to the, in some senses, free work of the West and see the line between art and the crassest commercialism has almost vanished, that in the work of many writers sexuality has supplanted men's fate, that so much is a mere chasing after fashion and aimed at a lucrative market. Should the Soviet authorities endanger their ideals by risking this sort of contamination? I think they should because their country is strong enough to do so. "Any claim to the autonomy of art must collapse", says Arthur Millar, "when a people is in danger, or struggling to preserve itself, and the single theme of Soviet political and social discourse for half a century has been its imminent peril before foreign and domestic enemies."

And one can see, too, that much of the foreign protests about Soviet divergents are made in bad faith. That, in truth, the protesters are more interested in making political capital against Communism than in gaining freedom for writers. The essence of any lasting society must not only be that it has noble ideals but also trusts man. Intolerance is a subjective expediency that is necessarily self-defeating. I believe this wonderful experiment, where, for the first time, on a tremendous scale, concepts of the community rather than individual aggrandisement is the high aim of education and society itself, in seeking less to defend itself will defend itself the more.

B. Lvov-Anoklin, in a preview to the book says: "Paradoxical as it may seem, it is because he constantly casts doubt on the value of his experience that we feel such tremendous respect for Tovstonogov and confidence in the correctness of his opinions. . . . He is an extremely versatile director who has tried his hand at all kinds of themes, genres and styles. Yet his productions all have one thing in common; they all deal with man as a member of society, are all in a major key, and all have a strong note of conviction running through them, the conviction that man is essentially good and strong, and that he is capable of reorganising life and making it good, too."

Besides being tolerant Tovstonogov does not abort the work of the people he admires most by placing them on a pedestal. He does say that one of Stanislavsky's opponents, Solomon Mikhoels, towards the end of his life, paraphrasing Schubert's appraisal of Mozart, said of Stanislavsky "In my early life I said, 'I'. Later I said, 'I and Stanislavsky', and later still, 'Stanislavsky and I'. Now I say, 'Stanislavsky'." (Surely "We" is better?) But, he goes on, "This is not to say that everything in Stanislavsky's teaching is beyond dispute and one hasn't the right to argue with him. But first one must understand him." Later, he says "We should arm ourselves today with Lenin's thesis that protecting our heritage means above all developing it." Let us consider, at this point, how many Marxists would be likely to recognise as Marx's the aphorism "Follow your own bent no matter what anyone says."

Stanislavsky in *An Actor Prepares* uses the term "Through conscious technique to unconscious creation". Which does really mean that the final creation is only partly conscious. It cannot start with a "vision"; the imagination must be allowed to work in the most unexpected directions, unexpected even to oneself. And since, in art, form and content are each part of each, some of the social values will be changed. Here is an example which Tovstonogov gives.

"Whenever the theatre fails to embrace the noble idea of man's right to freedom, it invariably remains at the inferior level of the moral principle 'the family is sacrosanct'. There is often a great

temptation to substitute the moral principle for the idea, as being more concrete and actual. However this practice is extremely dangerous, for it is confusing and harmful to the audience and injects their soul with the poison of philistinism. The Lenin Komsomol Theatre in Leningrad once staged a production of *Your Own Business* by L. Oshanin and Y. Uspenskaya. The play is about a party member with a wife and children, who falls in love with another woman but, as the authors would have it, prefers to stay with a woman he does not love and keep a clean Party card. And I must say that I myself, then manager of the theatre, was not worried by the thought that in struggling for a healthy family we were propagating an unhappy family, in struggling for moral purity, we were affirming mendacity as the norm of family life. Moreover together with the authors, we were presenting this as a true communist morality. . . . I must say in fairness that this frank admission is not intended to imply that L. Oshanin, whom I regard as an extremely gifted poet, is alone to blame for the theatre's mistakes. The general creative atmosphere in those years and the notorious 'no conflict theory' sent many of us off in search of conflicts that might be acceptable, since without conflicts there can be no drama and no theatre. The labour and marriage codes seemed perfectly suitable material for the stage in those days. Unfortunately we still come across works today that bring to the stage important decisions in the sphere of ideology or economics, without expressing the essence of life. Thus we find plays which debase the tremendously important problems of the moral responsibility of the individual towards society, reducing them to such philistine principles as 'It's not nice to cheat the State. And it's dangerous too. You can get put into prison for it'. Or 'It's a good idea to do a turn in production when you leave school. It's the quickest way of getting into the university'.

"Stanislavsky bequeathed us his system, the crowning achievement of which is his teaching on the super-super objective. This is the bridge between the play and life. The super-super objective cannot be determined on the basis of the play alone. It requires knowledge of life, and of the people we are working for. It requires not only knowledge but feelings, too. The super-super objective cannot be foisted on the artists. It must be the off-spring of the artist-citizen himself. The super-super objective makes the play the highly personal concern of the director and actor. Indeed this is what constitutes the noble purpose of service to one's people. The personality of the creative artist and the object of people, state, and Party are fused in the super-super objective, which is partisan and determines the spirit of the production."

I find this concept of Tovstonogov of the necessity of contem-

porariness to be a most moving and helpful consideration to me in any future art work, whether writing or painting, that I may endeavour to produce myself.

The final chapter in Tovstonogov's book is about his own production of Henry IV, parts I and II. It is impossible to do justice to his conception in a few short paragraphs. It is truly a Socialist Realist conception and has, as such, great authenticity. But Tovstonogov is never intolerant. He insists that there are other interpretations of the play that are valid. Here is what he says about the Boar's Head Tavern scene. "... where Falstaff and the Prince act a scene at court, Falstaff in the role of the Prince addresses Prince Harry as Henry IV. . . . 'Banish not him (Falstaff) thy Harry's company: banish plump Jack and banish all the world.' " "For me," says Tovstonogov, "these prophetic words were the key to the main idea of the play. Prince Henry has earned a permanent place in literature thanks to his friendship with Falstaff. After turning his back on Falstaff he has a place in history as King Henry V, but ceases to be a human being, as a moral character that is an artistic masterpiece. The Prince reformed and gained power but lost his real humanity. . . . True humanity in the play is represented by Falstaff, the plump, cowardly drunkard, the blasphemous liar and whore-monger. In this Shakespeare achieved something without parallel in world literature. The idea of genuine humanity is embodied in thoughts and deeds of this holder of all vices. Falstaff rejects the concept of honour because he is called upon to sacrifice his life in the name of formal honour." (Is he not a Good Soldier SWEIK, here?)

Tovstonogov goes on to say that Falstaff is being called upon to give his life for the King in a war brought about by one ambitious group of men pitting forces against another group of ambitious men in a ferocious power struggle. The war has nothing at all to do with the interests of the common people and is cruel and shattering in its senselessness for, whatever its outcome, the common people will be the losers. In Act II it is the end of the war, with a mound of corpses among which Falstaff lies pretending to be dead. Tovstonogov intended to make the mound of corpses as realistic as possible in order to destroy completely the "fine spectacle" aspect of war and battle, to ensure that there was no Walter Scott element in Shakespeare.

"In the late thirties", says Tovstonogov, "the leading Shakespeare authority, Morozov, interpreted Henry IV as a monarchist play, the Prince is a fine noble man, who played jokes and revelled with Falstaff and then 'reformed' and rejected such baseness. No doubt this is a valid interpretation—such is the scope and range of Shakespeare's work that it admits a practically unlimited number

of interpretations. But I feel this interpretation is quite impossible today.

“Despite the humorous and even farcical nature of many scenes, it is essential to display the gravity and poignancy of human destiny. The recruits are funny, but they are basically full of terror at the thought of impending death, each one expressing fear in his own way. They arrive. Five different expressions of terror. One expresses his fear in a forced display of courage, another in complete stupor, another in abject cringing and begging to be let off. These small parts carry great meaning for the play as a whole. They must be vivid, memorable characters impressing themselves on the minds of the audience. Here we are given another slant on the war—those that are going to fight and die in the game of raging ambition, the cannon fodder. They have reason to be afraid for they are doomed. Nobody understands this better than Falstaff, and he regards letting a couple of them go home for a small fee as an act of natural charity. And it is the two most able-bodied that he lets go, for, according to his reasoning, it makes no difference who is going to provide the cannon fodder in this senseless war which does not concern him unduly.”

Much of Tovstonogov's conception of the play is in line with our Peter Hall's conception in the War of the Roses programme with the Royal Shakespeare Company in which the King was more progressive than his opponents, the rich feudal barons who were trying to tear the country asunder and drag it back to feudal fragmentation. At the end of the play the King says “I know thee not, old man: fall to thy prayers; how ill white hairs become a fool and jester!” “Forgetting the prophetic words in the Boar's Head Tavern ‘. . . banish not him thy Harry's company: banish plump Jack and banish all the world.’ So indeed it was. It is not Prince Harry, the future King Henry V who immortalised Falstaff, but Falstaff who immortalised his crowned partner. It is thanks above all to Falstaff that the play lives on through the ages.”

Well, here is a book that deals with a great many aspects of a director's work; and with it the vital necessity for the director to be conscious of the needs of his time. Tovstonogov could never produce a classic as a classic, *per se*. He could only produce it with contemporary relevance and thus we learn from it. We do not go to the theatre to learn what to think but rather to learn how to think. Using it stimulates our imagination. “The theatre”, Tovstonogov says, “is called upon not to illustrate history but to interpret and recreate it. That is what the contemporary public expects from the contemporary theatre.” Tovstonogov has a great respect for Brecht and does not, as is so often done, place Stanislavsky and Brecht in opposition.

In a production of Gorky's *The Philistines*, he uses the leitmotif of

re-introducing a piece of popular music when the audience is under the hysterical "play-acting" of the characters and so enables the audience to have a wise detachment. (Probably in parallel, I guess, with their emotional embroilment.) A very interesting point of production arose when he was working on Gorky's *The Barbarians*. "A key point became the moment in the last act when Nadezhda Monakova, shattered by the collapse of her ideal, embodied in Cherkun, asks Tsyganov to step out on the porch with her. 'With you—anywhere! Even on the roof!' he says in reply. And hardly has the laughter subsided in the theatre than a shot rings out. Nadezhda has shot herself. In many theatres this line was omitted at the request of the actress playing Nadezhda, as reducing the tragic tension. But we can assume that Gorky knew what he was doing when he wrote that line." I agree.

The most moving and important chapter in the work, to me, was a very short one, entitled "Civic Responsibility in Art". I humbly suggest to *Soviet Literature's* Editor in Chief, Mr. Savva Dangulov, that he prints that chapter in its entirety in the multi-national editions of his magazine.

In addition to Socialist Realism, I think there is room for other work, in what one might call a minor key, which questions experience; does not affirm, but has a fascination with love, identity and the evanescence of existence. However Tovstonogov does affirm, yet he is tolerant. He is the centre of our present battles for progressing social morality, immediate political aims such as peace in Europe. And long term political aims which will eventually help us to make this earth our beautiful home and a spring-board to the stars.

For the present though, I think it is most important to have faith in the whole of humanity, beyond the frontiers of nations, class or creed. To remember Chekov, spitting blood, in the loneliness of Yalta, and writing these minimal and yet ultimate lines for Nina, the betrayed suffering girl "... to endure. To be able to bear one's cross and have faith. I have faith. I am not afraid of life". Tovstonogov has faith and optimism and professional expertise of a high order. He has written a beautiful book about it. In our changed and changing world this is to be a man of our time and of the future.

New Soviet Constitution

Marthe Brown

Two commissions have been engaged in recent years in reviewing the constitutions respectively of the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union. The Kilbrandon Commission in this country was appointed in 1969 and reported after four years in October, 1973. The Khrushchev Commission was set up in 1962 and so far it has not delivered a public report. From time to time it has been suggested in the Western press that the attempt to redraft the Soviet constitution has been abandoned and that nothing more would be heard of it. Yet reference continues to be made in the Soviet press to the continued existence of the commission and the continuation of its work. Brezhnev made special reference to it on the occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the Soviet Union. The law journals, such as *Soviet State and Law*, contain articles that show the project is still very much alive.

What is involved in redrafting a constitution? The American constitution is coming up to its bicentenary almost unchanged. In the opinion of most constitutional lawyers a redraft of it is unthinkable even though they would allow that it is rapidly becoming unworkable and that this contributes to the present spate of constitutional crises. In Britain the problems are different in that we have no written constitution and the characteristic features of the unreal forms of the constitution are held to be virtues.

The terms of reference of the Kilbrandon Commission were "to examine the present functions of the central legislature and government in relation to the several countries, nations and regions of the United Kingdom; to consider, having regard to developments in local government organisation and in the administrative and other relationships between the various parts of the United Kingdom, and to the interests of the prosperity and good government of Our people under the Crown, whether any changes are desirable in those functions or otherwise in present constitutional and economic relationships, to consider, also, whether any changes are desirable in the constitutional and economic relationships between the United Kingdom and the Channel Islands and the Isle of Man."

These terms of reference were open to wide or narrow interpretations according to how far one felt there was need for radical or only minor change. The commission recognised this but said of the wider interpretation that "even if we had felt qualified to tackle the whole constitutional field, the proper performance of that task would have engaged us for a quite unreasonable length of time".

In spite of this the minority report of the commission went a good deal further in widening the terms of reference in the time available than did the majority report.

The latter selected three major complaints that had been levelled against the existing constitution describing them as three defects that had to be remedied. These were over-centralisation of government, a weakening of democracy and a failure to provide for the adequate expression of national feeling. It reported that "while the people of Great Britain as a whole cannot be said to be seriously dissatisfied with their system of government, they have less attachment to it than in the past and there are some substantial and persistent causes of discontent which may contain the seeds of more serious trouble". This trouble could be avoided by devolution; one simple remedy only was needed. "We think that devolution could do much to reduce the discontent."

The minority report recommended radical remedies involving improvements and additions to the existing central institutions to make them more effective in coping with the major economic problems confronting the country.

The British examination of the constitution shows that, here as elsewhere, when the system of government is felt to be inadequate in some respects two different sets of proposals for remedies emerge. One takes the form of decentralisation of government and/or administration and the other moves in the opposite direction towards even greater centralisation by strengthening the central government institutions. Something like the same division of view emerged in discussions about the Soviet constitution in the Soviet Union after the second World War.

Before we look at this it may be helpful to examine an earlier attempt to redraft the British constitution along radical lines. Sidney Webb published *A Constitution for the Socialist Commonwealth of Great Britain* in 1920. In describing the constitutional provisions for securing the liberty of the individual he added several words of warning. He said "the machinery of administration of any national industry or service—covering an area nation-wide, supplying a thousand separate needs, impinging on ten million families—is and must necessarily be complicated. It is true, moreover, in a certain sense, that this complication is a characteristic of democracy. The simplest of all governmental systems—so at least it seems at first sight—is that of uncontrolled autocracy. The unrestrained dictatorship of the capitalist achieves in industry a similar simplicity—so at least it appears at the outset—by the identity of the ubiquitous motive of private profit, and by the ruthlessness of competition in the struggle for existence. Neither autocracy nor the capitalist system long retains, as a matter of fact, its assumed pristine absence

of complications, but is found, in practice, to become a whole mass of complications, cycles upon epicycles and wheels within wheels, only concealed from the ordinary citizen by business or bureaucratic secretiveness. But however this may be, democracy cannot afford to dispense with complication in its administrative machinery, because only by an extensive variety of parts, and a deliberately adjusted relation amongst those parts, can there be any security for the personal freedom and independence in initiative of the great mass of individuals, whether as producers, as consumers or citizens. It is only by systematically thinking out the function that each person has to perform, the sphere that must be secured to each group or section, the opportunities in which each must be protected, and the relation in which each must stand to the others and to the whole, that in any highly developed society the ordinary man can escape a virtual, if not a nominal, slavery. Those impatient democrats who will not take the trouble to understand the problem, and who petulantly demand, at the same time, the elaborations and refinements of civilisation and the anarchy and simplicity of the primitive age, cannot in the nature of things ever be gratified. The condition of any genuine democracy, of the wide diffusion of any effective freedom, is such a systematic complication of social machinery as will negate alike the monarchical and the capitalist dictatorships, and prevent the rise of any other. The price of liberty—of individual variety and specialisation ‘in widest communality spread’—is the complication of a highly differentiated and systematically co-ordinated social order.”

Impatient democrats, in Webb’s language, make the mistake of going for one simple remedy for discontent or confine their search for remedies to the purely political sphere without recognising that it is only in the complicated arrangement of political and social institutions that freedom for the whole people is to be secured. There was of course a long tradition in this country of protest by individuals against the political and the social order that, they were convinced, did not serve their needs. Some did demand a return to “the anarchy and simplicity of the primitive age” but most demanded a different set of complications. The simplicity of the primitive age has never quite lost its appeal to the romantic intellectual. At times whole tides of opinion seemed to be moving in this direction. Lord Bryce was writing his *Modern Democracies* at the time when Webb’s work was published and he noted the decline of representative institutions (which was the title of one of his chapters). Fascism was to conceal a new set of complications behind the romantic screen of the primitive age.

After the second World War it seemed that the tide was being reversed. New constitutions in Europe and the old colonial territories

showed ample recognition of the need for "systematically thinking out the function that each person has to perform" though they did not all succeed in the very difficult task of translating this thought into workable constitutional provisions. Impatient democrats in this situation were in most cases absorbed in the business of running this new complicated social order and those who remained as outsiders were temporarily silenced. They burst forth in criticism when the new order ran into difficulties and usually it was in order to attack the complication of the political and social arrangements. Many of the complications peculiar to wartime scarcity had rightly to be removed but gradually this removal process was extended to the complications that had been felt necessary for the building of a peacetime social order.

The angry young men made most noise and attracted most comment but the angry middle-aged men went quietly ahead with the demolition work on the machinery of administration as the source of all evil in the world. Though this never amounted to a massive retreat to the primitive age, it was a retracing of steps some distance back. The only way forward was seen to be in the direction of more and more complications of the kind that were then the current object of criticism. Planning and all forms of interference by the central government in the economic life of the country were restrained or abolished. The powers readily conceded to the central government during war to ensure victory were during peace denied to the government to ensure prosperity.

In the Soviet Union, in contrast, the complicated arrangements embodied in the constitution of 1936 remained along with the practical applications of them that had been made during the war. The Soviet constitution of 1936 had been hailed by the Webbs in the second edition of *Soviet Communism* as "a political masterpiece". They said that the "'Twelve Tables of the Law' enshrined in the new constitution of the Soviet Union, as it was enacted in December, 1936, will be judged by the world according to the way in which these provisions are found to be actually working, say, in December, 1942, after five years' experience without war! Today they at least mark a distinct stage in political progress; and they point in what seems to most Britons and Americans, Frenchmen and Scandinavians, the right direction."

It is often argued that because the constitution was not allowed to work for a five year period *without war* the complications of the "political masterpiece" remained untested and unproved. The weight of evidence shows however that the complications worked in holding together the new social order under the greatest stress and proved their worth in the peacetime reconstruction after the catastrophic destruction of the war. Reading now the words that

the Webbs wrote then makes one suspect that the assertion that most Britons and Americans accepted the Soviet arrangements as being in the right direction was a naive exaggeration. And yet attempts were made to reproduce them throughout the West and they were successfully replicated in the constitutions for the liberated territories of Eastern Europe. Their abandonment in the West gave rise to mounting criticism by impatient democrats of their doctrinaire retention in the East. A new "right direction" became the fashion.

There were critics, some of whom seemed to qualify for Webb's title of impatient democrats, of the Soviet arrangements in the Soviet Union. Some notes of complaint, allegations of defects and calls for remedies, in something like the terms noted in the Kilbrandon report, were evident at the Twentieth Communist Party Congress in 1956. The main point of discontent was of course the abuse of centralised power in arbitrary ways rather than the centralisation of power itself. It was sometimes difficult to distinguish, in some of the criticism, between the abuse of power and the existence of the power. But the final resolution of the Congress called for measures "to strengthen Soviet justice and to ensure that the rights of citizens guaranteed under the Soviet constitution are strictly observed". At the next Congress, in 1959, Khrushchev spoke about the need to revise the Constitution of 1936 when discussing the plan for the development of the national economy. He said "In today's conditions, when our country is entering a new and important period of its development, the need has arisen for the amendment of the Soviet constitution. Over 20 years have elapsed since its adoption, which have been full of events of world historic importance. Socialism has emerged from the frame of a single country and become a mighty world system. Important changes have occurred in the political and economic life of the Soviet Union. The building of communist society has become an immediate practical task for the party and people. All these enormous changes should be reflected and provided for by legislation in the constitution of the Soviet Union." The final Congress resolution provided that "Certain amendments and additions should be made to the Soviet constitution".

Some preparation for these amendments was made during the redrafting of the Party programme and rules during the period from 1959 to their adoption in 1961. It was in the new programme that "the state of the whole people" was defined although the constitution of 1936 still provided that it was a "socialist state of workers and peasants". The old constitution was possibly more in need of redrafting than the programme and the rules because it was so universally known as the Stalin constitution. One could reasonably

expect there to be popular support for the idea of redrafting it, but the press gave little evidence of any widespread demand for this to be done quickly. It was in any case known that once the programme and rules had been dealt with attention would be turned to the constitution. Khrushchev confirmed this in his opening report to the 1961 Congress when he said "The new Constitution of the Soviet Union which we are starting to draft must express the new characteristics of Soviet society during the full-scale construction of communism." He developed the point some six months later at the Supreme Soviet in April, 1962, when he said "The constitution of a socialist state must alter as society moves from one historical stage to another". He went on to claim that "The main provisions of the constitution are now obsolete in that they do not reflect the changes that have occurred in the society during the past 25 years and do not conform to its present stage."

He explicitly rejected the idea of trying to tamper with the problem by amendment of the existing constitution in a piecemeal fashion. This could be interpreted to mean that the various measures associated with his policy of decentralisation begun in 1957, which had in themselves necessitated minor amendment of the constitution, was something that had already passed by and much more dramatic changes in the constitution were needed for the future.

Different interpretations of these pronouncements were made in the press and in the Soviet journals. *Izvestia* took what one might call the programmatic line and called for a constitution "delineating a new stage in the development of Soviet society and state, further improvement in the standard of socialist democracy with stronger guarantees of democratic rights and freedom with strict observance of socialist legality, preparing the way for the transition to communist social self-management." *Pravda* and most of the journals gave a narrow interpretation suggesting that the new constitution would merely be brought up to date to reflect changes that had already occurred.

Speculation revived after a report in *Izvestia* in June, 1962, that a commission had been set up to draft the constitution, in accordance with terms defined by Khrushchev, and that nine sub-commissions had been set up to draft the various sections, exactly as had been done in the case of the drafting of the 1936 constitution. Nothing significant was heard about any progress with this work until the end of the year when there was a further note in *Izvestia* and Brezhnev referred to it in a speech on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the formation of the Soviet Union.

Little more was heard until July, 1964, when some details were published about the chairmen of the sub-commissions. Brezhnev formally took over as chairman of the main commission in December,

1964, and articles began to appear in Soviet journals suggesting that there was support for a substantial change in the constitution along the lines of decentralization. There was even the suggestion that the electorate should be given the choice among several candidates at elections in one article that attracted a good deal of comment in the world press.

It was then popularly believed in the Soviet Union that the commission's draft proposals would be presented for public debate on some dramatic occasion in the near future, such as the Lenin centenary or the 50th anniversary of the revolution. In mid-1966 Brezhnev said in a campaign election speech that "the best things that state construction in our country has produced should be embodied in the new Soviet constitution that will crown the magnificent half century stage on our country's road".

This meant that a little under 18 months remained to complete the redraft (which was the total time taken for the 1936 constitution draft). This timing was confirmed by the editorial in *Pravda* on Constitution Day at the end of 1966, followed a little later by the publication of the names of the members who had been appointed to replace those members of the commission who had lapsed for one reason or another.

Throughout 1967 there was official silence about the new draft and the speeches on Constitution Day in 1968 and 1969 made no mention of a new constitution but emphasised on the other hand the adequacy of the existing one which provided full guarantees for all rights, political and social. These claims were interpreted in the West to mean that the whole project for redrafting the constitution had been abandoned. The explanation offered for this view was that the events in Czechoslovakia, that had been closely connected with a project for redrafting the Czech constitution, had so alarmed the Soviet political leaders that they had decided to stick to the old 1936 constitution. Publication of a new draft constitution would in any case re-open big questions of rights and liberties that had proved to be so divisive and disruptive in Eastern Europe generally.

Discussion did however continue in the Soviet journals in articles referring to the constitutional reforms in other countries, particularly with reference to Yugoslavia. The Yugoslav proposals, in 1969, for replacing the state with public self-government were heavily criticised as misguided applications of the idea of the withering away of the state. Similar proposals to decentralise administration to the extent that the state became inevitably fragmented were also attacked. These articles were again noted in the West as further evidence that the redrafting of the Soviet constitution had been suspended.

An editorial in *Pravda*, in December, 1972, returned to the subject

saying that one "of the major subjects that we shall have to resolve in the near future is that of the Soviet constitution The present constitution adopted in 1936 reflected the elimination of exploiting classes and consolidated the victory of socialism. During the three and a half decades since then major changes have occurred in the development of Soviet society. It is well known, in this connection, that a new draft text of the Soviet constitution is now being worked out. . . ."

Brezhnev had in fact devoted a considerable part of his speech on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Soviet Union to constitutional reforms. He argued that "changes in our life and the tasks confronting our society in the new conditions should be reflected in the Soviet constitution. We have discussed this before and the appropriate preparatory work is being done. In the opinion of the Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Council of Ministers it is now time to complete this work. We expect to submit appropriate proposals on a new draft text of the constitution for nationwide discussion before the next Party Congress. . . . It will not only help Soviet people and the whole world to understand better what we have achieved and sum up the results of the path we have traversed, but it will also shed new light on the future development of our socialist society which is advancing to communism."

So the project was not after all stillborn but why was the period of gestation so long? In the West the more serious critics argued that the commission that had been set up to produce the draft had been impeded in its work by faction fights for power in and around the Kremlin. They discerned two main factions; one was alleged to have sided with Khrushchev and to be continuing his policy, which was loosely described as liberalization, and the other faction, made up of so-called hard-liners, were opposed to any measures that would tend to weaken the central power and authority of the state. There are certain attractions about this diagnosis if only because it appears to be based on something like the distinction made by Webb between the impatient democrats and the realists who see the need for centralised power. There is some reflection here also of the majority and minority report positions of the Kilbrandon commission.

There are however some important qualifications that need to be made in respect of the particular situation in the Soviet Union. Brezhnev emphasised in his speech at the 50th anniversary celebrations, as a preamble to his discussion of the constitution, that priceless gains had been made in the cultivation of "lofty moral and political qualities" in the Soviet people. But he went on to give a serious warning that "all this does not mean that the

political, educational and ideological tasks facing our society have already been accomplished. It is no secret that social sores still exist, inherited from the past and essentially alien to socialism, such as unconscientious attitudes to work, shirking, indiscipline, money grabbing and other violations of the norms of socialist society, that are still frequently encountered. The Party believes that it is its duty to call the attention of our entire society to these phenomena and to mobilise the people for a resolute struggle against them as it will not be possible to build communism if this is not done."

The existence of large numbers of people in the Soviet Union who are not yet wholly imbued with the "lofty, moral and political qualities" needed for the building of communism is certainly no secret. Their existence in the Soviet Union in the 1930's, at the time of the treason trials, reminded many commentators in the West of the groups in England that went on harking back to the good old days long after the rebellion of 1640 right up to the 1760's and even beyond until 1848. They form a willing audience for impatient democrats and for all calls to revert to primitive society. They can be as disruptive a force in the Soviet Union as they were in this country during the 18th century. Their claim for political rights and the power to exercise them irrespective of the needs of other groups within the society is almost always advanced for separatist and selfish reasons. Their political ideas and campaigns are adopted in modified forms by all elements in societies that are opposed to the existing order.

This does not mean that all claims by minorities for some measures of independence are necessarily separatist or selfish. If the claims are advanced in terms that tend to reverse the direction in which the society is developing, or are advanced as they seem to be in the recommendations of the Kilbrandon commission report as a means for quietening discontent (itself the source of more serious trouble), then to admit them is to invite disruption of the economic and social order. This seems to be the burden of the minority report, of the Kilbrandon commission. If, on the other hand, they are advanced as a means to strengthen the basis for the centralised power and authority of the state their adoption will have quite different effects and will strengthen the economic and social order.

There is as serious a danger in trying to separate the political and social relations (as Webb pointed out in the passage quoted above) as there is in trying to elide the two. In Britain it is held to be a virtue of the constitution that we can say sensibly "Long Live the Queen—Down with the Government" because the social and the political are in this way distinct. In the U.S.A., on the other hand, it does not make sense (as present critics of the President well know) to say "Long Live the President—Down with the

President” because the social and the political are not distinguishable in the constitution. The problem of relating the social and political is of course recognised by Soviet constitutional lawyers.

It has been argued in the Soviet Union that the constitution is the basic political law and not the law of society. Most lawyers, on the other hand, argue that Soviet constitutions have always included provisions relating to the social and economic order and that it would be a retrograde step to try to produce a purely political constitution. They point to the new constitutions in Eastern Europe. The constitution of the German Democratic Republic of 1968 has chapters devoted to political principles; economic principles; citizens’ basic rights and obligations; enterprises, cities and other entities in socialist society; trade unions and their rights; and socialist productive cooperatives and their rights. The constitution of the People’s Republic of Bulgaria of 1971 has similar provisions.

The complicated relations between the political and socio-economic arrangements of a society, as Webb indicated, are not easy of definition. The problem is even more difficult when one is dealing with a society at a critical point of change in these arrangements. We have already noted that the programmatic elements suggested for inclusion in the constitution are not accepted by everyone. Some have held that the predominant view at the time of the 1936 constitution was that it should merely represent what was called “conquered territory”, by which was meant the arrangements already realised in the society. The programmatic elements are much in evidence in the more recent constitutions for the People’s Democracies and it seems likely therefore that the draft of the new Soviet constitution will contain such elements. Their definition is perhaps even more difficult to achieve than that for the existing relations. When one begins to define the future in anything like millennial terms the door is opened wide for impatient democrats to introduce disruptive activities. Marx indicated this in a penetrating way in his *Critique of the Gotha Programme* a century ago.

When the draft for the new Soviet constitution is published it will be the subject of lively debate in the Soviet Union and Western critics will doubtless support all those impatient democrats that exist in the Soviet Union. Nevertheless it is a task that has to be faced and it will provide a forum for discussion that will enable one to see the connection between claims for particular political rights in the broad context of the complicated social relations that Sidney Webb insisted were the basic problem of constitution drafting.

SERGEI ESENIN

Dr. Jessie Davies

(An examination of Poeticheskii Mir Esenina, by Alla Marchenko, published by Sovetskii Pisatel', Moscow, 1972, 309pp.)

Sergei Esenin is today the most popular and most read poet in Russia—a fact borne out by the lightning speed with which editions of his work, now printed in millions of copies, as well as any critical literature about him, disappear from the book counters. And so it seems somewhat surprising that in the flood of literature which appeared about him immediately after his death in 1925, and, following a thirty-year period of forced eclipse, in the ever-increasing flow of memoirs and critical literature from 1955 to the present day, which reaches a total somewhere around the two thousand mark, there have been relatively few full-length books. Indeed the number of full-length books in French for some time compared favourably with the number in Russian, but even so can be practically counted on one hand. Italy, too, has always maintained a lively interest in the poet, a recent *Knizhnoe Obozrenie* (No. 14, 1972) revealing that Esenin has been translated there no less than twenty times.

This makes the appearance of *Poeticheskoe mir Esenina* more than welcome. This is a book with a difference, for in her preface the author makes it clear that the book is designed for the reader already thoroughly familiar with Esenin's work and with the readily available critical literature about him, including the substantial monographs of E. Naumov, P. Yushin and Y. Prokushev.

Whilst it seems certain that the author has no knowledge of the émigré Esenin critic V. Markov, her aims to some extent coincide with his, for both seek to destroy the universally accepted "legend" of Esenin which portrays him as a deceptively simple, easily accessible poet, a kind of "Ivan-Tzarevich". Esenin, the author maintains, is in fact complicated and enigmatical even for such experienced readers as professional poets themselves. Both writers stress the profound influence of Gogol' on Esenin's poetic thinking and both take a second look at Esenin's attitude towards the Revolution, a question about which there has been so far little unanimity amongst critics. But then A. Marchenko's book goes considerably further—Markov's *Legenda o Esenine* (Grani No. 25, 1955) was after all only a long article—and aims to examine Esenin's work as a consummate stylistic system and as an organic whole, each part of which bears the stamp of the poet's "special personal mark" (*osoboi metoi*). In order, too, to establish his ideational and stylistic ties with 20th century poetry, she has decided to consider Esenin in relation to Pasternak, Zabolotsky and Akhmatova, as well as to the peasant poets Klyuev, Oreshin and Shiryayevets, and to his fellow-Imaginists Shershenevich, Mariengof and Ivnev. A great deal of new material emerges here, especially in regard to some hitherto unsuspected influence of Oreshin, Shiryayevets and

Shershenevich on such poems as Esenin's *Comrade, Song of the Great Campaign, The Black Man* and even the *Persian Motifs*.

This book is the culmination of many years' study of the poet's work. Alla Marchenko first brought herself to the notice of the reading public in 1959 with the publication of an article on the recurring imagery in Esenin's poetry—*Zolotaya Slovesnaya Gruda* (Voprosy literature No. 1)—perhaps the first really profound study of its kind. For a long time I laboured under the delusion that "A. Marchenko" was male, and used to imagine that I detected in the crisply logical and analytical style, which I much admired, a gallic trait not noticeably typical of Russian critical writing. I was, therefore, more than a little taken aback at our first meeting to be confronted by the most feminine of creatures.

Since then she has written a great deal, both on Esenin and on other aspects of contemporary Russian poetry and prose, but that first impression of a strong, deeply-penetrating and indeed a bold style still remains. There is, too, another quality in her prose which at times wars with its "gallic" precision—a quality which I would say she shares with Pasternak—and which I can only describe as a leaping and surging forward, involving parentheses and periods, of a torrent of words to express the quick, impetuous, scintillating thought, as it plunges onward, seeing new facets of an argument, apprehending new correspondences, in short, as Esenin himself put it, the ability to "fix" or "seize" (ulovit') in a word the almost "unseizable", (neulovimoe)—"what we think about with the shades of our thought" (p.121).

A poet herself and a talented translator of Armenian poetry as well as a literary critic, she possesses many of the qualities necessary for the analysis of the work of this poet who qualified himself as "kraine individualen".

Esenin once remarked *à propos* of Blok's *The Twelve* how easy it would be to exhaust oneself over a subject "at first glance simple but in essence of cosmic proportions" (p.284) and A. Marchenko's book is in fact an attempt to demonstrate that these remarks could with equal justice apply to his own work, from Blok's first comment on it in 1915: "Fresh, pure, vociferous, verbose", to Gorky's verdict in 1926: "Astonishingly polished poet with original talent".

Her critical approach is original and arresting, for she traces—and highlights—the poet's creative evolution through constant short allusions to his poems, his art treatises—the *Keys of Mary* is used almost as a "concordance" for the long "biblical" poems—and his correspondence. It goes without saying that such an approach is a source of constant delight—and illumination—to the inveterate Esenin lover. The question arises: is the book also of interest and of value to the reader new to or not well-versed in Esenin's work? There is no doubt at all that the future student of Esenin will benefit enormously from reading this book and will indeed be spared some of the enigmas which in the past have beset many an assiduous Esenin reader, since, as the author points out, he was invariably "skupoi na ob'yasneniya" (p.120).

In 1918 Esenin wrote the following strong words after his short-lived flirtation with the Proletkul't: "The human soul is too complicated to be fettered in one set 'sphere of sounds' of any one living melody. In any sphere it will burble like the water in the mill-race as it is sucked into the weir, and woe betide those who dam it up for they will be the first to be swept from its path as it bursts forth in a raging torrent." In just the same way, the author points out, "Esenin's poetry is too complicated to be fettered in one set sphere and it will sweep away any hypothesis whose author, deceived by the static quality of Esenin's work, fails to reckon with the 'waves below the surface' breaking through the 'artificial dam'" (p.305).

In nine shortish chapters—unnumbered, but each bearing as a title an apposite quote from Esenin's own work—she traces the poet's complicated evolution. Chapter 1 is devoted to the phenomenal talent of the pre-revolutionary poetry and examines in detail Esenin's brilliant use of colour, scents and sounds. Chapter 2 touches on some of the poet's well-known contradictions—for example his ability to fuse concrete art with fantasy and spontaneous lyricism with strict artistry, and compares and contrasts the landscapes in Esenin's poetry with those of Pasternak and Akhmatova. The mingling of Christian and pagan motifs in his work is also examined here. Chapter 3 discusses his sense of kinship with the animal and plant world and lays stress on the curative powers which Esenin sees in close ties with nature. Whereas Zabolotsky seeks to "teach" nature, Esenin attempts to learn not only from the "neizrechyonnaya zhivotnost'" but also from the "razumnaya plot' ". Chapter 4 is devoted entirely to an examination of his use of the image and Chapter 5 examines the exalted period of image-building when the Revolution breaks into the structure of his verse. Esenin, the author points out, in fact frequently "slanted away" from the "peasant slant" with which, by his own admission, he accepted the Revolution—for him at this time the leitmotif of the "biblical" cycle of poems was the spiritual transformation of the world. Chapter 6 is devoted to a discussion of the poems of protest, an account of Imaginism and an examination of the drama of the disenchanted rebel *Pugachov*. Chapter 7 examines the influence of Blok and the gypsy romance on the poems of *Tavern Moscow*, the role of the chatushka in Esenin's changing style and includes an extended analysis of *The Black Man*. Chapter 8 discusses Esenin's turning away from "Western" poetry to the East as to the land of true poetry for he had brought home the impression from Europe that poetry there was considered as almost "indecent". Marchenko throughout is extremely sensitive to the changing dominant in the poems and skilfully demonstrates how in the pre-revolutionary verse everything is subordinated to landscape, then in the long "biblical" epics to ornament, in the *Persian Motifs* to melody and in the "gypsy" songs and in the later ballads to narrative and rhythm.

In Chapter 9 perhaps the optative word is "perestroenie", for here Esenin's work is seen by the author as a process of building and perpetual re-building (ustroenie i vechnoe "perestroenie"—

Esenin's own word from a letter to Ivanov-Razumnik in 1920) to meet the needs of the moment, an "otkrytost' vsemu novomu": and more than that, every "ustroenie" bears in it the key to the future "perestroenie", from the prophetic pronouncements of the long revolutionary epics, through the anguished poems of non-acceptance and revolt to the dark "tryum" (again Esenin's word) of *Tavern Moscow* and *The Black Man*, and the new use of conversational language in the poetry written after the return from Europe.

The book contains many excellent analyses of particular poems—almost in the classic manner of the "explication de texte"—amongst which can be cited *O krasnom vechere* (p.16), *Za tyemnoi pryad'yu perelesits* (p.74), *Poi zhe poi* (p.184), *Ne vernus' ya* (p.250), *Ne zhaleyu* (p.255), *Sukin syn* (p.256) and Pasternak's. *Caucasian poem* "Vecherolo. Povsyudu retivo" (p.36).

Especially powerful pieces of writing are: firstly the analysis of *The Black Man* (pp.188-123) which is examined in great detail both in relation to Pushkin's *Mozart and Salieri*—a habitual comparison—and to Gogol's *Portrait*—a totally novel one. Perhaps a word might have been added here about Musset's *Nuit de Mai* which Esenin almost certainly knew, if one remembers his apologetic letter to Mani-Leib after a drinking bout in New York, in which he claimed to suffer from the same disease as Musset—"l'autoscopie" or the ability to see one's own double. Secondly, the analysis of the *Land of Rascals* (pp.268-75) where the author shows herself to be much more open-minded than previous critics as to where Esenin's sympathies lay, nor does she with her "umnyi um"—to use an expression of Mariengof—spare the earlier critic P. Yushin when he makes unfounded assertions in the matter;—and thirdly the analysis of *Anna Snegina* (pp.290-7) where a skilful comparison is drawn for the first time between this poem and Esenin's early prose tale *Yar* of 1915.

Since for reasons of space one can only dwell briefly on this many-sided book, for sheer brilliance of writing I would single out for the reader's attention pp.88-9 where the author demonstrates how Esenin's imagery both "sails like a boat" and "pecks its way out of the eggshell" like a chicken, and pp. 120-1 where the extraordinary proliferation of the imagery of the ornamental epics is discussed. In this chapter where the ten long "biblical" poems are examined in detail, the fact is stressed for the first time that these poems were in fact choral oratorios written in the style of the church liturgy, which would at that time have been familiar to his readers, that they are in fact polyphonic and represent several voices expressing opposing views. Finally I would commend p.184 where the author demonstrates how the poet puts into practice his own dictum: "The poet's gift is to caress and scratch, he is branded with fate's seal, I wanted on earth to marry the white rose to the black toad", up to p.187, which shows how Esenin's "treasure-chest with instruments for the finest embroidery", mentioned in the *Keys of Mary*, is later exchanged for an "obnishchaluyu dushu-sumu".

Esenin's poetry has many hidden layers of meaning and since one never quite reaches the end of them, it gains enormously from being re-read—and the same goes for *Poeticheskii mir Esenina*. After a perusal of this book even the reader most versed in Esenin's poetic mastery cannot but come away enriched and enabled to re-read the poetry with new eyes and deeper understanding. More than anything else Esenin emerges here as the champion of free art and of a free spirit, who sees man as an everlasting journeyer to new realms of experience (vechno stranstvuyushchii strannik), who in his youth saw the ornamental horse on the hut ridge as a sign that man is ever on the move (my tol'ko v puti), who characterised the revolution with the words "zemlya poekhala" and who already foresaw the days of cosmic flight: "Space will be conquered . . . and landmarks for safe sailing will be placed everywhere, and mankind will communicate from the earth not only with the close satellites amongst the planets, but with the whole boundless universe." (p.308)—words which prompted Leonid Martynov to say: "You who will today and tomorrow be turning the pages of Sergei Esenin, author not only of *Tavern Moscow* but of *Pantokrator*, as you re-read these poems with awe and reverence, do not thoughtlessly neglect the prose of Sergei Esenin—the contemporary of Lenin, Tsiolkovsky and Einstein." (p.308).

Defects? These are the usual faults of Soviet books—a lack of chapter numbers and of any kind of index or content summary (there is a list of chapter headings on p.310), hence my constant references throughout to specific page numbers. Though the source of many of the quotations is given, the author tends to assume, not always correctly, that her readers are as familiar as she herself with the small print of the works, and even more footnotes in this respect might have been helpful.

A happy collaboration between husband and wife is evident in V. Murashev's highly ornamental and intricate pen-and-ink drawings which so admirably interpret the theme of each of the nine chapters. Just as the author demonstrates her ability to convey "to, chto ne vyrazit' serdtsu slovom i ne znaet nazvat' chelovek", so the artist succeeds in portraying the same quality visually. Since Esenin considered the decorative and ornamental aspects of his work an integral part of peasant Russian art, this type of illustration is particularly apt and instructive.

Moscow

A City in which time loses all meaning

Teresa Fisher

When I heard that I was lucky enough to be offered the 10-month Russian scholarship to Moscow University, I spent many pleasant hours imagining what I would be doing "this time next year". I was by no means a stranger to Moscow. Nevertheless, the past few months have surpassed my wildest dreams and hopes. The tone was set when I was met at the station by no less than three people, together with a bus for my luggage. I had arrived five weeks late, due to administrative complications, and people could not do enough for me to help me to settle in. By the end of my first evening, as I stood in room 213, surveying my new home, I felt as if I had been in Moscow indefinitely.

There are 46 students from all over the world on the language course. We are very fortunate to be living in the giant Moscow State University building which, situated on the Lenin Hills, commands a magnificent view over the town. We live in blocks of two single rooms and a bathroom; the rooms are very well equipped, with a radio in each one, and there are two communal kitchens on each floor.

We study at the preparatory faculty for foreign students five days a week, six hours each day. At first I thought I had been lucky with my group, for our teacher is not only extremely good at her difficult job of explaining the sometimes baffling points of Russian grammar, but is also a very kind and considerate person. However, I soon found out that everyone is equally impressed with the infinitely patient teachers, who all take a personal interest in the lives and well-being of their group. They have become our "Russian mothers", only too willing to listen to our problems. Apart from Russian language, we also have lectures and seminars in history and literature. These too are very well taught and the lecturers are always prepared to answer questions, whether or not related to their lectures. We have Wednesday and Sunday free, with an excursion in and around Moscow every other Wednesday. We wondered how we would adapt to working on Saturdays but it does not seem strange at all and in fact it has proved to be very useful to have a break mid-week.

Living as a Russian student, as opposed to being a tourist, one has the unique and extremely interesting opportunity to observe and participate in the everyday life of Moscow, shopping at the same shops, stalls and markets as the Russians, standing in the same good-tempered queues and buying the same food. The delights of the famous black bread and ice cream are certainly not to be passed up, nor are the delicious glasses of kefir and hot pirozhki. Shops here are open until 8 p.m., including Sundays for the food shops, which greatly facilitates life, and the cheap and frequent transport service makes one very mobile.

Moscow has an unbelievably rich cultural life and with our very generous Soviet grant we are able to participate in it to the full. At least five nights a week I am left speechless with breathtaking performances of War and Peace, Eugene Onegin, The Tsar's Bride, Russlan and Ludmilla, Don Carlos, Rigoletto, Swan Lake, Don Quixote, The Legend of Love, The Government Inspector, Oblomov, The Red Army Ensemble and the Beriozka Dance Group, to mention but a few. One of the highlights of my concert life here was being able to talk to Khachaturyan as he signed his autograph after a performance of his Rhapsody for Cello and Orchestra, played by Rostropovich. The standard of the performance is always extremely high and the stage sets and costumes are so ingenious and well-designed that the entire audience is enraptured. I feel that I have somehow fallen into a magical world and am so entranced by the sheer colourfulness of the stage that I am completely disorientated when I come out into the street and try to make my way back to the University. The buildings themselves of the Bolshoi Theatre and the Kremlin Palace of Congresses more than justify buying a ticket for an opera or ballet. The enormous gold and crystal chandeliers in the Bolshoi and the vast banquet hall in the Palace of Congresses, where it is possible to taste the delights of blini and smetana, ice cream and champagne, are simply two more reasons why an evening out in Moscow leaves one with unforgettable impressions and wonderful memories. I was lucky enough to be able to see the ice-skating championships held in Moscow. The atmosphere was contagious, and it was an incredible experience to watch live the seemingly impossible jumps and figures which I had previously seen only on television.

I do not thoroughly enjoy myself only in the evenings however. My free days are so full that in no time at all it is time to go to classes again. I spend many fascinating hours exploring parts of the town off the beaten tourist track. Moscow is a city full of contrasts. Highly ornate yellow and green brick buildings, tall glass and cement constructions, and low wooden houses all intermingle with each other, and rows of stalls selling fruit, vegetables, ice-

cream and beer, stand side by side with the huge supermarkets and department stores. Non-made-up tracks lead off the main roads to the courtyards and blocks of flats. Old women in black headscarves and dresses rub shoulders with young girls in their bright fashions. Benches are conveniently placed in the courtyards and small parks for pensioners to pleasantly pass the time of day and for the babushkas to proudly show off their grandchildren. Moscow is a town in which two different eras manage to live in great harmony.

Every fortnight the House of Friendship puts on a film show for us and often organizes meetings with such sectors of the Moscow population as the Academy of Sciences, Cosmonauts, children's writers and members of the Moscow Soviet, all of which are extremely interesting and informative. These events are followed by a variety concert, often with famous performers. The Moscow branch of the USSR-Great Britain Society arranges meetings, to which I am invited and which I also enjoy immensely. To celebrate the anniversary of Robert Burns' birth a Burns evening was organised, with talks on various aspects of the poet's works, a recital in "Scottish" by one of the British Embassy staff and a concert of songs based on Burns' poems and performed by leading Soviet singers.

The fiftieth anniversary of Anglo-Soviet diplomatic relations was a great occasion. Speeches were given by the editor of *Izvestia* and the British Ambassador, Sir Terence Harvey, and congratulatory telegrams were read from the SCR, the BSFS and the GB-USSR Association. An extremely good variety concert rounded off the celebrations.

I am often invited to meetings of various English clubs and once was asked to be a member of the jury of a phonetics competition held by the English Club of the History Faculty. Visits to schools, institutes, and factories, where we are showered with souvenirs and questions, leave one full of vivid impressions and memories.

I am lucky in that I have many Russian friends and have frequent invitations to spend Sundays and evenings with them so that I am able to experience Russian family life.

My previous visits to the Soviet Union had been either in the spring or summer and so I was thrilled to have the chance to see Moscow in the snow. A Russian winter is a winter never to be forgotten. It makes the descriptions of the winter in the Russian classics come alive and is a truly memorable experience. The snow on the fir-trees and statues enhances the natural beauty of Moscow and it is fascinating to observe the winter-dressed population, with the men in the traditional fur hats, the ear flaps pulled down when the temperature reaches -20°C , and the small children bundled up in fur hats and coats, making them look like delightful

teddy-bears. I soon discovered that the sledges on which the children are pulled to school by their fathers, briefcase in one hand and a rope attached to a sledge in the other, have right of way on the pavements, and was most impressed by the efficiency with which the great army of snow clearing machines removes the snow from the main streets and squares. With many hundreds of others I experienced the delights of skating on a floodlit, ice-covered basket-ball court to a background of piped music, and of skiing in one of the many forests on the outskirts of Moscow. It is a wonderful sight to watch Muscovites skating hand-in-hand along the pavements of the Gorky Park of Culture on a Sunday morning. I got quite used to standing next to little boys and adults alike clutching skis and sledges in the metro and buses bound for the Lenin Hills. The Moscow winter air is extremely invigorating and makes one look and feel very healthy. Half way through the winter is the fortnight-long Russian Winter Festival, which offers exhilarating Troika-rides in the snow-covered Botanical Gardens of the Exhibition of Economic Achievements, followed by vodka and smoked-salmon sandwiches, tea and cream-cakes. All in all, a winter spent in Moscow has all the attractions and effects attributed to a winter sporting holiday in the Alps.

Part of the excitement of living abroad for any length of time is having the opportunity to take part in the various national holidays. I shall long remember the fun in getting up early on November 7th and walking in the column formed by students of Moscow University through the town and up into Red Square, clasping huge red paper carnations. The drizzle of that November morning could in no way dampen our enthusiasm or that of the thousands of other people who were out on the streets. The main streets and squares were adorned with decorations and coloured lights, and in the evening I had my first experience of the national "walking of the streets". Whole families thronged the centre of Moscow, strolling up and down the streets and Red Square. There was a wonderful carnival atmosphere, which was enhanced by a magnificent firework display.

Christmas, 1973, was for me an unforgettable one, for my Christmas dinner was shashlik cooked over a charcoal fire in the open air, followed by a mug of steaming coffee and a poppy-seed cake, at the Exhibition of Economic Achievements. No caviar or champagne could have tasted sweeter.

The build-up to the New Year celebrations is terrific. At least three weeks beforehand giant fir-trees, festooned with fairy lights and paper decorations, are put up outside the main public buildings and in the squares, and the shop windows are decorated with figures of Grandfather Frost and silver tinsel. The atmosphere of this

three-day mid-winter holiday is something that has to be experienced to be believed. No wonder thousands of foreign tourists descend upon Moscow in order to share in the celebrations. Like a true Muscovite I walked up and down the streets eating the deliciously creamy ice-cream in temperatures of -15° and then watched a special New Year entertainment on television until 4 a.m.

With the spring comes the promise of exciting trips to far-off places in the USSR and I know that if the next months are half as exciting as the past ones have been I shall have a wonderful time. The days are so full and fly by so quickly that time loses all meaning. It is as if a giant time-machine is at work turning weeks into days and months into weeks. My camera has been busy at work but it can capture only some of the memories of this truly memorable year. The Russian Winter Festival justifiably receives a great deal of publicity. As far as I am concerned, however, Moscow is an all-year festival.

RUSSIAN PAINTING

Readers whose interest in Russian painting may have been stimulated by Dr. Alan Bird's article on The Growth of British Interest in Russian Painting in this issue may like to know that the SCR Library contains a rich collection of illustrated art books. These are classified into sections: Albums, History of Art, Painters (individual albums, 19th and 20th Century artists), Artists of the 15 Republics, Graphic Art, Folk Art, Applied Art and Theatre Sets. Many (though not all) may be loaned to members; all may be consulted at 320 Brixton Road, near to Brixton Underground station on the Victoria Line. It is desirable to make prior arrangements with Miss Timbey.

STAGE DIRECTION

The Profession of Stage Director by Georgi Tostonogov, reviewed by Donald Bisset, is available from Central Books for £1.50 (15p for p. and p.). Readers may wish to know that Mr. Bisset, who is well known in this country as an actor and writer of children's books, is the most popular English author of children's books published in the Soviet Union.

An Interview with Sergei Obraztsov

(translated from *Literaturnaya Gazette* 5/12/73)

Looking each other straight in the eye

"How many times have you travelled to other countries?"

"I've never reckoned up. About 50, or maybe 60."

"You've seen 60 different countries?"

"No, fewer than that, 27."

"How's that?"

"Well, I've been to some countries more than once. Three or four times, or even five."

"Lucky chap. What a lot you must have seen. Been to Italy?"

"Yes."

"America?" "Yes, there too."

"Japan?" "No."

"You really must. They say it's a beautiful country."

"It doesn't depend on me. You see, I never went anywhere as a tourist. Either on an official trip to a Congress, or to give performances abroad. Mostly the latter."

"And the people of which country did you like best?"

"I can't answer that question. There are no bad peoples, but bad people can be met everywhere."

"So I've got through almost the whole range of questions I usually have to answer. But I'm not often asked the really important question: 'What purpose do these visits serve, for whom are they necessary?'"

"I went abroad for the first time 47 years ago. It was a guest tour of the Musical Studio of the Moscow Arts Theatre to Czechoslovakia, Germany and the United States. Autumn and winter 1925-6. Emigres of various periods turned up, on Wenceslas Square, in Charlottenburg, or on Broadway, it was incredible."

"Where are you from?" I was asked by a man with a Russo-American accent.

"Moscow."

"Impossible", and the man dropped his parcel of sausages. "Are you going to live in New York?"

"No, we're going home in May."

"Where to?"

"Moscow."

"Back to Moscow? But we've got prosperity here. What are you, a Communist?"

"No, I'm not a Party member."

"And you're going back?"

"Certainly I am."

The man picked up his sausages from the floor and went out

through the revolving doors. I went up to the counter and brought out with some difficulty: "Geev me pleez two hot dogs." This is the American for sausages.

English words fell on my ears as they fall on the ears of a year-old baby, but in five months on tour I accumulated enough to be able to "chat" with a cafeteria owner. In Germany words swam in my mind, dredged up from the depths of school German lessons. Every day there were more of them, and they threaded themselves together, turning into whole phrases complete with verbs in the pluperfect. I could go visiting, played the fool with children in the streets, taught them to play tip-cat.

In July 1941 there was the first air raid on Moscow. My neighbour across the landing, the film producer Sergey Yutkevich, shared fire-watching duty with me on the roof of a block of flats in Nemirovich-Danchenko Street. We pushed the incendiary bombs down into the courtyard. This was my home town, where I was born. I understand where every land mine exploded. This one is on Nikelsky Street, this one is near the rail termini, that one is across the river. Parachutes with flares hang over the streets like huge chandeliers. Tracer bullets fly up into the sky in brilliant points of light, trying to reach the silver birds caught in the beams of the searchlights crisscrossing the sky. In every "Bird" there are airmen hurling bombs on to the city. Could they be the same Berlin urchins I played tip-cat with in '25?

Directly after the war, the Central Puppet Theatre was sent off on a tour to Berlin, Dresden, Leipzig. I know of course that we are going to a different Germany. And yet at that time the almost biological memory of the war was too strong. Why should we entertain people, among whom might be those who had blockaded Leningrad and bombed Kiev and Moscow and hundreds of other towns and villages in my country?

At the station we were greeted with flowers and smiles. But it's not difficult to get flowers, is it? Or to make one's lips smile? No, the welcome at the station didn't convince me of the necessity of these tours.

The first evening show. I wander round the stage, the wings, and feel all worked up. The hall is crammed with spectators. Who are they? Friends? Enemies? The actor must feel a partnership with the spectator. Otherwise it's hard to act. And a partner is inevitably a friend. In this, in this alone, is the strength of contact with the spectator, and only this contact creates the show. There goes the third bell.

Who is concealed there in the darkness of the auditorium, now that the lights are dimmed? Can we expect a real relationship? Laughter? Pleasure?

The overture. Up goes the curtain. Applause. Nothing proved as yet. I wait for the funny bit. Here it comes. A burst of laughter. A joyful reaction.

Somehow they don't sound like enemies. After the show the stage is invaded by curious spectators. Cheerful, affable folk. Not a trace of tension. Some with children. For almost an hour we showed how the puppets worked. They showered us with compliments. "Wunderbar." "Wunderschon." "Unmöglich." With the help of my limited dictionary I conversed with a man, who invited me to his home the next day. He said it was quite close. (Nicht zu weit.) Well, anyway, if it had been "zu weit", why not go? I must.

I arrived. It was a small room. A canary in a cage. A table. At the table an eight-year-old girl was doing her homework, with mother's help. Mother got up and greeted us. She looked at me with kindly eyes. The girl scowled, looked at me with stern hostile eyes. It was understandable. All her short conscious life, she had only heard of the Russians as enemies.

A panel in the wardrobe was smashed. The canary had one eye missing. I asked why. Rather embarrassed, the man explained. "During an air raid we were all in the shelter, and when we came back, we saw that the house next door was destroyed, our windows were blown out, the wardrobe was overturned and the crushed cage was rolling about under the table."

How could the girl look at me any differently? It was a Russian bomb. And now a Russian had come into the room. By hook or by crook I had to get out of this German girl's head the stimulus that triggered off its conditioned reflex. And I could only do that if I removed the "splinter" of my own conditioned reflex, that the Germans were enemies.

So it turns out that our journey was indeed necessary. Our tours are necessary. For the Germans and for ourselves. If we all really want peace and friendship, and this is a fact, it means that we cannot keep in our hearts the conditioned reflex of hostility, not one of us has the right. It is impossible to make friends, to fight for peace, in theory, just with declarations, one must meet with a handshake, face to face, heart to heart.

Since then I've been many times to Berlin, the capital of the GDR. And recently, at a get-together of the Friendship Society with our country, a woman I didn't recognise came up to me. She was about 30 or more, and she presented me with a bowl of tropical fish and said, "Here, take it. You are interested in aquaria. Here are some of my special fish. We're not strangers, we've known each other a long time. You came to visit my Mum and Dad, remember? You asked about the canary."

Now I've got dozens of friends, in Berlin, Dresden, Leipzig. Real

close friends. And the Berlin Academy of Arts elected me as a corresponding member.

I remember our first performance in West Berlin. Mr. Barlog, who was at that time head of the Schiller Theatre, invited us to act a few items in his theatre.

Our first meeting. How will it turn out? A cool polite reception and correct applause at the end? It proved to be exactly the opposite. A success, and what a success! We took 24 curtain calls. Then the heavy, thick, reinforced fire curtain came down but still the audience wouldn't quieten down. Then a little door opened in the fire curtain and we pushed through again to appear in front of the enthusiastic crowd.

The next morning there were reviews in all the papers. Not a single one was unpleasant, or sceptical, or snide. One of them said: "It was not just a theatrical triumph, it was a political success too. For two hours Germans and Russians shared a single heart."

We found the same thing at our performance in Munich at the Olympic Games, and in Dortmund during the Days of Soviet Culture arranged for the visit of L. Brezhnev to the Federal Republic.

What did this mean? Why was it that our shows evoked extra emotion from the audience in West Germany of all places? Precisely because the conditioned reflex that Russians are enemies is still being deliberately fostered there by certain circles, and when the stimulus disappears and the Russians are felt to be friends, joy is born. It cannot fail to be born. In every single country the ordinary people do not and cannot want war. Mothers do not want their children to cry out in fear. The wives don't want to be widowed.

We put on shows for both adults and children. In Montreal, Canada, "Aladdin" just happened to come on New Year's Eve. Only in Moscow it was already night, and in Montreal still daytime. I came out and spoke to the children: "Tonight we shall celebrate the New Year. I wish you a Happy New Year. But the sun comes earlier in Moscow, and in an hour's time it will be midnight there. Just when you see the Magriba desert on the stage, and the lion appears."

Backstage we got the champagne ready. The company had tears in their eyes. It really hurt, not to be in Moscow. There are our families, sitting down to a festive supper, and we've got to perform! Up goes the curtain on the Magriba desert. The lion appears. And suddenly a chorus of children's voices fills the hall—"Happy New Year".

Make what you like of that. For me this is the essence of "friendship between nations".

Many years ago I was walking round Calcutta with a camera. A curly-haired beggar boy of about ten wanted to help me, to earn

a few coins. He showed me what he thought was the most interesting. I took him to the show—"Aladdin". It was his first visit to the theatre. He heard the Eastern music, rather like that of India. He saw a palace, rather like the Taj Mahal. An elephant, just the sort they have. After the show he ran off and came back with another boy, a beggar like himself, to show me to him and prove he hadn't been lying. I wanted to give them some bananas, oranges, peaches. We had plenty. The children wouldn't take anything. They were happy just to meet us. To meet some Soviet Russians. Those lads must be about 20 now. I'm sure they haven't forgotten.

Our theatre went to many towns in India, and in each town they fixed up special open-air theatres made of matting, they set out benches and the whole improvised "pit" was filled, sometimes with grown-ups, sometimes with children. At the end of the show they hung garlands of real roses and gold thread on every actor. Once we spotted Nehru among the children, and afterwards he invited us all to his home. An unforgettable meeting.

In the terminology of official organisations these are called "cultural contacts". For me they are something more. A joyful striving for friendship. Looking each other straight in the eye.

My wife and I travelled over ten thousand kilometres along the American highways, giving solo concerts at colleges. After every concert we sat until the small hours, either in the students' Common Room or in a professor's flat, drinking Coca Cola or whiskey and soda and answering thousands of questions. We were the first Soviet visitors they had met in person. In the dining room of one of the colleges hung a notice: "Everything Russian today". There was borshch, pieces of meat called shashlyks, and the cook had put on an embroidered skull-cap and tied a red sash round his white shirt.

After every show, in Italy or France, Finland or Yugoslavia, in Hungary, Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, Britain, Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, India, Holland, Belgium or Denmark, the audience thronged backstage, old and young, cheerful, excited, surprised. Again and again we showed how the puppets worked, signed autographs, answered millions of questions, and these "contacts" were no less important than the shows themselves. Dozens of times we waited at frontier railway stations for the wheels to be changed, we went up and down the ramps of Ilyushins, Tupolevs, Boeings, Caravelles, and at frontiers and airports we took out our Soviet "hammer and sickle" passports.

But of course we and our theatre are only a drop in the ocean of all the foreign tours undertaken by our country. Before handing over this statement to the Press, I rang the Ministry of Culture and was told that in the last six months thousands of Soviet actors, singers and musicians had toured 77 countries; 190 solo performers of

various kinds had taken part in international competitions and festivals. Next year Soviet artistes will perform in 116 countries.

So what are these foreign tours exactly? Not tourist attractions, not Trevi fountains, Cheops pyramids or Eiffel Towers. No. They are a tremendously important battle for friendship and peace, a splendid battle with every kind of art as the weapons. These weapons are of incalculable value, as are their victories.

Our country and its people, our Party and government, are doing everything possible to ensure peace; to see that hotbeds of war are extinguished wherever they occur, to widen cultural and business ties between countries and peoples.

Recently, when I was a delegate to the World Peace Conference in Moscow, I heard how literally every delegate spoke from the platform and in the lobbies about the role of our country in the struggle for peace. And I am proud of the fact that we who work in the field of Soviet art are taking part in this vast struggle.

Translated by C. E. Simmonds.

BOOK REVIEWS

Planning Problems in the USSR, by Michael Ellman, *Cambridge University Press*, 1973, 222pp., £4.80.

The sub-title of this work is 'The Contribution of Mathematical Economics to their Solution 1960-1971', and it is published in the series of Monographs of the Department of Applied Economics at Cambridge. A non-mathematical reader should not, however, be deterred. Remarkably little of the book apart from two chapters, one of which is about linear programming (containing indeed some criticism of the great Kantorovitch), involves any knowledge of mathematical techniques; and most of it is a remarkably clear, and in the main non-technical, description of what mathematical economists have sought to do and actually achieved (as well as claimed to be able to achieve), together with a careful and detailed discussion by the author of the kind of Economic Reform favoured by this school of theorists. As such one can say that Dr. Ellman's work constitutes the most thorough and authoritative, and in many ways the most balanced, treatment of the subject of the proposed economic reforms which have preoccupied economic discussion in the Soviet Union and other developed socialist countries since the early '60's. It also gives detailed reasons why the changes inaugurated in 1965 in the Soviet Union have largely failed in their intention (and equivalently those introduced in Hungary a year or two later have had a much larger measure of success). It is hardly surprising that a work of this kind should be occasionally heavy going. In places perhaps it could be said to be rather *too* concise to have explicit meaning for the uninitiated reader. But in the main (as

we have said) it is most clearly and cogently expounded, and the exposition, far from being conducted (outside two chapters at any rate) at an abstract theoretical level, is unusually rich in concrete detail, supported by an impressive fund of documentation from original sources.

Dr. Ellman is exceptionally well-equipped to be our leading authority on this question, since he has first-hand knowledge of what he is talking about, acquired during a two-year stay as an exchange student in Moscow in the crucial years 1955-67, where he studied in particular the work of the Soviet mathematical economists on the spot. He can therefore talk from first-hand experience. His bibliography of Soviet writing is itself impressive, running to 16-17 pages of closely packed titles of books and articles.

The defects of what Dr. Ellman calls the 'administrative economy' (centralised planning as in the past) are by now pretty well-known; and Dr. Ellman starts by listing them in considerable detail—not only irrationalities in production and shortages of crucial inputs from faulty supply-allocation, but also failure to provide consumers' goods in anything like the assortment required by consumers, leading to shortages and queues, simultaneously with the piling-up of unwanted goods on the shelves and in warehouses, which factories stubbornly go on producing because such goods can clock-in nonetheless as 'plan-fulfilment'. He has a chapter explaining in detail the inevitable inconsistency in some degree of plans constructed by the 'balance method', partly owing to lack of requisite information, partly because indirect and secondary effects of any initial change of plan are ignored; partly because only a fraction of all the multitude of products are subject (or possibly could be) to the balance-method in any case, and because, to avoid the uncertainty of inflated plan-targets and/or deficient supply-allocation, individual enterprises have an inevitable bias towards easily-achievable targets and supply information accordingly about their own productive-capacity and productive needs. As for computerisation solving all problems: "The compilation of . . . a plan for the tens of thousands of products for which the USSR state plan sets targets, requires the carrying out of milliards of calculation . . . whereas a man equipped with a desk calculator can only do 1,000-2,000 calculations per day. Even if the splitting up of the work were possible (which is impossible with these relationships) the whole apparatus of Gosplan could not do one-hundredth of the necessary calculations for this group of plan indices".

But while recognising the need to replace the so-called 'administrative economy' (with everything decided from the top) by a decentralised mechanism, Dr. Ellman is not one to swallow the claims of those who think that the introduction of free pricing and a market system will serve as a magical panacea. He forthwith subjects the theories of 'optimal planners' to critical scrutiny, and dismisses their more extreme claims as resembling too closely the defenders and justifiers of the 'free market system'. He is sceptical

of if not actually hostile to the Liberman-notion of profit as the performance-indicator for the enterprise. Mostly these reservations are a just and timely rebuke to the more naïve claims of 'market socialism' which we commonly hear; although one may perhaps be inclined to think his strictures on the optimisers a trifle overdone (has not our author himself aptly commented elsewhere that when in the company of men dying of thirst in the desert it is inappropriate to devote time and emphasis to the possible dangers of water-drinking?) When it comes to the optimisers' concrete proposals for reform, however, he is apt to be on their side; and he has no hesitation in conclusion in coming down in favour of the view that "the problems of the administrative economy . . . are not accidental, that it is not possible to eliminate them by changing the personnel, and that their elimination requires a major change in the economic mechanism".

Chapter 7 which poses the question 'what kind of economic reform?' opens with a fairly lengthy examination of the rather naïve sociological view called by him the 'Parkin-Lanc thesis' that the whole issue of economic reform is primarily a social struggle for hegemony between the so-called 'white-collar intelligentsia' and the *apparatchiki*. This view is criticised and rejected: it is held to ignore, for example, that "the waste generated by the administrative economy, and its negative effects on personal consumption, have a severe adverse effect both on working-class living standards and on working-class attitudes to production". Among the detailed reforms needed, in Dr. Ellman's judgement, to change this are listed the following: an ending of the chronic condition of 'sellers' market', lacking reserves or with reserves in the wrong hands; "production programmes should be determined in accordance, not with plans imposed from above, but with orders received from customers . . . particularly important in industries where output is heterogeneous, such as clothing and engineering"; supply-allocations to be replaced in the main by wholesale trade; more flexible prices; "transition from incentives for adopting a taut plan to incentives for high results".

Altogether a most impressive and exceptionally well-informed study on a subject of outstanding importance for socialist theory and practice.

MAURICE DOBB,
*Trinity College,
Cambridge.*

Mandel'stam by Clarence Brown, *Cambridge University Press*, 1973, 320pp., £4.75.

Gautier, one of Mandel'stam's inspirers, once wrote "Oui, l'oeuvre soit plus belle, d'une forme au travail rebelle, vers, marbe, onyx, émail"—and I would hasten to add—Mandel'stam and Professor Brown, for both of them have a style with which the reader must

be prepared to wrestle. The subject of Professor Brown's book is basically Acmeism—a movement which we were once led to associate with a renewal of clarity in poetry and a discarding of the mists of symbolism.

One thing at least comes clear from the book—that there were as many brands of acmeism as there were acmeists, and certainly Mandel'stam's brand had little to do with clarity, for as a poet he is demanding, erudite and arcane. He is a poet's poet whose work, as C.B. puts it, is full of "recondite verbal elegance and chaste architecture of form". In another book Professor Brown has described him as "available only to those who aspire to membership of a poetic élite", in contrast to Esenin who is placed at the bottom of the ladder "for wide general consumption". Like most generalisations this one is mistaken for there are far more points of contact between the two poets than is generally supposed. One has only to compare their two great poems written during the years of famine and civil war—Mandel'stam's *Twilight of Freedom* (May 1918) and Esenin's *Marine Ships* (September 1919)—with their startling similarities of imagery and vocabulary, to realise this.

Mandel'stam belongs to the far too large band of writers who are designated in the 1968 *Short Literary Encyclopaedia* as having been "illegally repressed", but unlike many of them he still does not have even the cold comfort of the words "posthumously rehabilitated". One hopes that the publication in 1973 of a volume of his verse in the series *Biblioteka poeta*, which was announced as far back as 1966, even though in a pitifully small edition of 15,000 copies, marks a beginning of his rehabilitation in the Soviet Union. Mandel'stam was one of a "pleiade" of gifted poets all fairly closely contemporary: Mayakovsky, Esenin, Akhmatova, Pasternak, Gumilev and Tsvetaeva. Like Esenin he was haunted by death and like Mayakovsky, Gumilev, Tsvetaeva and Esenin he died prematurely and tragically. Even in his own day Mandel'stam's poetry was stigmatised as "chill poetics". Grusinov, one of the rival school of "Imaginists" wrote of him "O, Mandel'stam's poetry is about the past and the far-off . . . But these measured lines, these correct rhythms are empty and dead. Dust and decay." (*Imaginisma Osnovnoe* M.1921, p.16).

Today we have a totally different image of his work, thanks largely to the tireless efforts of Clarence Brown, Gleb Struve, Boris Filippov and the poet's widow, Nadezhda Mandel'stam, to preserve his heritage in the West. Paradoxically as his sufferings increased and his freedom was curtailed his poetry grew in stature and his genius reached its greatest power and intensity. "It is astonishing", his friend the poetess Akhmatova wrote "that expanse, breadth and deep breathing appeared in Mandel'stam's verse, precisely in Voronezh when he was quite unfree". (*Vozdushnye puti.*, 1965, No. 4).

It is always a difficult task to write a monograph on a poet, an even more difficult one to write on a foreign poet. We must all know of examples which are an awful warning of how not to tackle the

job. The problems are manifold; how much space is to be devoted to the biography, how much to the themes of the poetry, how much to its style? Are these three elements to be interwoven or treated separately? Are translations to be included, if so, in prose or verse, and are the originals to be appended—in this case in cyrillic script—which will add immensely to the publishing costs? How valid still are Taine's old criteria: *la race, le milieu, le moment*? Or do we need new guide lines, new yardsticks for measuring genius? And there is little doubt that Clarence Brown is dealing here not just with genius, but with genius of a most tragic and pathetic kind. For these reasons an unequivocal welcome must be given to Professor Brown's new work. He has set himself a threefold task: to write a biography of a poet whose early life remains shrouded in mystery, to present and analyse the poetry for the non-specialist and to translate or in other ways convey the poet's work to the reader who has no Russian. He has chosen to devote Chapters 2-8 to the biography and Chapters 9-14 to the poetry, freely admitting that the poems intrude into the biographical section and the biography into the critical—perhaps an inevitability. The real disappointment of the book lies in the fact that the detailed biography suddenly breaks off after Chapter 7 (p.120) and the important years of exile are treated only in note form in Chapter 8—perhaps because Nadezhda Mandel'stam has already filled in the picture in her moving memoir *Hope against Hope*.

The disappointment continues when one discovers that the examination of the poetry does not cover the period of the *Voronezh Notebooks* and much of the material which has only just come to light. The critical chapters comment on and explain Mandel'stam's first two books, *Kamen'* and *Trishia*, and the poems from 1921-25 after which the poet fell silent for five years, then the book comes to an unexpectedly abrupt end with no conclusion. Perhaps indeed it should have been labelled "Volume 1". But our chief gratitude must go to Professor Brown for over 150 pages of invaluable "explications de texte" of this difficult poetry, and for the light which they throw on what he describes as "the ever-lasting colloquy of M's poems with each other". The prose translations—not appended but an integral part of the text—preceded by the invaluable cyrillic originals are likewise an outstanding feature of the book (an index of them would have been helpful). To my way of thinking they are better than the verse translations which he has recently published in collaboration with a poet, W. S. Merwin, who has no Russian.

Notwithstanding some vagaries of syntax and some rather abstruse literary terminology in the text, the merits of Professor Brown's scholarly book are so great that one indeed hopes that a second volume is on the way, to round off this study of the life and works of a great poet.

DR. J. DAVIES,
University of Liverpool.

Problemy Byta Gorodskovo naseleniya SSSR, Trufanov, I.P., (Problems of town life in the USSR). Izd. *Leningradskovo universiteta*, 1973, 144pp.

Preodolenie sotsial'no-ekonomicheskikh razlichiy mezhdru gorodom i derevnei (Overcoming Socio-Economic Differences Between Town and Country). Semin, S.I., *Moscow, Nauka*, 1973, 160pp.

If it is true, as Churchward suggests in his recent book *The Soviet Intelligentsia*, that only half of all Soviet research in the social sciences ever sees light of day, we are particularly fortunate to have access to these two works. The Trufanov book, presented for publication by the N.A. Voznesensky Finance and Economics Institute in Leningrad, contains a fund of information on modern urban life in the USSR. That serious research on urban-industrial sociology is long overdue is testified to by the four sections of the book: the long and complex introduction on method and basic concepts; the description of such research conducted just before and after the revolution—from Prokopovich's 1909 time-budget study of Petersburg workers to Kabo's and Strumilin's research in the 1920's; the 20-page frank description of Western urban sociology; and, finally, the empirical studies that fill the latter two-thirds of the volume. How urgent such studies are is evident from the fact that the urban share of the population has grown from 20% in 1926 to 56% in 1969 (p.3)—or that industrial workers increased their share of the population from 48% to 55% in the decade 1959-1969 (p.33). The empirical section is based on two areas of the country: Leningrad and the Tatar Autonomous Republic. The Leningrad study was made in 1965 and 1970 and embraced some 3,500 workers in the engineering industry; a similar questionnaire was filled in by 7,230 workers in Kazan, Al'met'yevsk and Menzelinsk in 1967. Wage differentials among the Leningrad workers in 1970 varied from R106 (R97.5 in 1965) for the unskilled to R133 (R127 in 1965) for construction engineers, R131 (R109.8 in 1965) for economists and technicians, and R191 (R172.9 in 1965) for department heads; over 10% of the latter received over R250 in 1970 (pp.62-63). Housing conditions appear to be similar for all groups: housing space per person has increased from 6.1 sq. m. in 1965 to 7.3 sq. m. in 1970 in Leningrad (p.71). Nonetheless, only 27.4% of families have a separate flat consisting of two or more rooms (p.71). The statistics on cultural behaviour are particularly interesting and show wide variations among the different socio-economic groups: for example, nearly 30% of all unskilled workers read no books (p.82), 15% never read a newspaper, 64% never read political literature and 37% never go to the theatre (pp.80-81). In Kazan, Russians tend to be more "cultured" than Tatars—27% of Tatars have no libraries compared with 17% of Russians (p.82); but in the two smaller towns, national differences are insignificant (p.83). The higher a man's socio-economic status, the less likely he is to have a wife doing manual industrial work: while 60% of manual workers have working wives engaged in manual labour, only 13% of

construction engineers have “worker-wives” (p.96). These and many other useful statistics make this book an important contribution to studies of Soviet town life.

If the Trufanov book portrays town life, the volume by Semin, authorised by the Institute of Economics of the USSR Academy of Sciences, looks exclusively at the countryside. While he does not base his conclusions directly on his own empirical studies, the author culls his information largely from statistical handbooks and other people’s field work. The first of the four sections is devoted to a theoretical substantiation of the need to eliminate the main differences between life in town and country: despite the growth in amenities and virtually complete literacy in the countryside (99.5% in 1970—p.29), much remains to be done. For example, while industrial productivity has increased 18-fold since 1913, productivity of agriculture has grown only five times (p.29). Section 2 deals with the “two forms of socialist property”—state and collective farms. The most remarkable transformation in farming in recent years has been the trend from kolkhozes to sovkhoses: in the 20 years up to 1970, the latter trebled in number, while the former decreased by 6.7 times (p.111); kolkhozes now account for only 40% of all cultivated land, less than half the pastures, 40% of the gross agricultural production and 48% of the marketable produce (p.43). But they still embrace over half (57%) the rural population (p.54). Despite the fact that, since 1950, over 20,000 kolkhozes (said to be the most “backward”) have voluntarily become sovkhoses, the author warns of the dangers of becoming “dizzy with success”: “many unwarranted changes have resulted in a decline in farm output and a failure to use all opportunities inherent in the kolkhozes” (p.46). The personal plots clearly still play an important part: while accounting for only 3% of cultivated land in 1970, they were responsible for 28% of gross farm output and 12% of marketable produce (p.38). Section 3 describes the improving mechanisation of farm work and the state’s growing investment in the collective-farm sector: state investment increased between 1961 and 1970 from 53% to 62% of total investment in kolkhozes (p.94). The final section shows the wide differences in various republics: thus, while an average rural district contained 11 kolkhozes and 5 sovkhoses in 1970, the figures were 27 and 9 respectively for the Baltic republics, but 2 and 8 respectively for Kazakhstan (p.115). Finally, an interesting comparison is made between material conditions in town and country: while the average industrial wage in 1970 was R122, the average income on a sovkhos was R101 and, on a kolkhoz—R77 (p.149). The kolkhoz figure, however, is said not to include income from personal plots, which makes up between 25 and 30% of a collective farmer’s income (p.149). A useful volume in its own right, this book is even more valuable as a complement to Trufanov’s urban study. The greatest regret with both books is that they lack an index, bibliography and name on the spine.

J. W. RIORDAN,
University of Bradford.

Soviet Government: A Selection of Official Documents on Internal Policy, ed. by Mervyn Matthews. *Jonathan Cape*, 1974, 472pp., £12.00.

This expensive volume contains 92 documents (or extracts from documents) divided under five heads: Government and Administration; The Party; Legality, the Courts and the Police; The Peasant and the Land; The Worker and His Labour). They are described by the editor as "essential for understanding the development and texture of Soviet polity."

The selection, says Dr. Matthews, "reflects my own personal proclivities." It does indeed. According to my Pocket Oxford, a proclivity is a "natural leaning or tendency" and the examples given include "a proclivity to vice . . . for saying the wrong thing". Dr. Matthews' "natural leaning or tendency" seems to be to depict the Soviet Union in the worst possible light on every possible occasion. Thus, there is great emphasis on the restrictive, coercive aspects of legislation, but little attention paid to legislation dealing with such matters as education, social welfare and the like. It is symptomatic that he should omit 15 clauses from the Principles of Labour Legislation—ten dealing with Labour Protection and five with Disputes Procedure.

Dr. Matthews' "natural leaning or tendency" likewise shows itself too obviously in his commentaries. He describes the Bolshevik decree on the press of 27th October, 1917, as "the suppression of the non-Bolshevik press" when a reading of its text shows that it was not, and when we know from other sources that not only non-Bolshevik but also *anti-Bolshevik* newspapers continued to appear after its adoption ("The anti-Bolshevik newspapers continued to appear and to attack the Bolshevik policy with violent abuse", write R. H. Bruce Lockhart in his *Memoirs of a British Agent*, referring to early 1918).

There is a marked shortage of material dealing with industrial administration and management. The September, 1965, measures on the improvement of industrial management, the October, 1965, measures on planning and incentives, the July, 1967, statute on ministries, the September, 1968, statute of the State Planning Committee—these are just a few of the documents which should be included in any selection which purports to depict "the development and texture of Soviet polity." Mention has already been made of the inadequate attention paid to social legislation; the omission of any reference to the 1968 legislation on marriage and the family, and that of 1969 on public health is a case in point.

The "List of Document Titles" would be improved by the inclusion of page as well as document numbers.

DENNIS OGDEN,
Polytechnic of Central London.

NEW SOVIET ART BOOKS from COLLET'S

RUSSIAN PAINTERS OF THE EARLY 20th CENTURY

New Trends.

Compiled by D. Sarabyanov.

Aurora 1973. Cloth, 34 x 25cm. 208pp. Ref. 8089 **£6.00**

79 full page colour plates of painters which include: Brodsky, Golovin, Ivanov, Konchalovsky, Kuprin, Kustodiyev, Kuznetsov, Nesterov, Petrov-Vodkin, Riabushkin, Rylov, Goncharov, Vinogradov, Zhukovsky. Each section with introduction in English and Russian.

IL'YA GLAZUNOV

Introduction by I. Yazykova.

Moscow 1973. Cloth, 29 x 22cm. 160pp. Ref. 8088 **£3.50**

120 plates, mainly in colour, and a short biography of this still living artist in English, French and German. Text and commentary in Russian.

ART OF THE AUTONOMOUS REPUBLICS OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Compiled by V. Vanslov.

Aurora 1974. Cloth, 24 x 19cm. 200pp. Ref. 8091 **£6.00**

192 plates mainly in colour of work in the 16 autonomous republics within the RSFSR. Includes examples of painting, sculpture, graphic, decorative and applied arts. Introduction and captions in English and Russian.

MOSCOW MONUMENTS OF ARCHITECTURE OF 14th-17th CENTURIES

1973. Cloth, 30 x 27cm. 96 text pages in Russian and English.

Ref. 8070 **£9.00**

240 black and white and coloured plates plus 85 others in the text. A superb album.

* * *

ROMANY

by Mikhail Bulgakov.

1973. Cloth, 21 x 14cm. 812pp. Ref. 10819 **£1.25**

Contains: Belaya gvardiya; Teatral'nyi roman; Master i Margarita with introduction by K. Simonov.

Collet's

**Denington Estate, Wellingborough,
or 39 Museum Street, London WC1**

PROGRESSIVE TOURS

EXPERTS TO THE USSR

Air tickets, Rail tickets, Hotels

Amongst our tours are:

- (1) 3 weeks in Leningrad schools November 9 to 30 £120.
For 6th formers with Russian "O" level.
- (2) Business language course in Moscow October 1974
including class for beginners.
- (3) Christmas/New Year language course. Details available shortly.

PROGRESSIVE TOURS

12 Porchester Place,

London W2 2BS

01-262 1676